2016

"Get Tough on Juvenile Criminals": An Assessment of Punitiveness and Punitive Attitudes

Richard Charles Gehrke
Minnesota State University Mankato

“Get Tough On Juvenile Criminals”: An Assessment of Punitiveness and Punitive Attitudes

By

Richard Charles Gehrke

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

In

Sociology

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

April 27th, 2016

"Get Touch on Juvenile Criminals": An Assessment of Punitiveness and Punitive Attitudes

Richard Gehrke

This thesis has been examined and approved by the following members of the student's committee.

_____
Paul Prew-Advisor

_____
William Wagner-Committee Member

_____
Colleen Clarke-Committee Member

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to begin my thanks with Dr. Paul Prew! Paul guided me through my thesis with his thoughts, his help with the data analysis portion of this project, endless amounts of feedback and consultations, and my thesis is just as much his work as it is mine. I also want to thank Dr. Bill Wagner and Dr. Colleen Clarke for agreeing to serve on my thesis committee and for their feedback which contributed to an even better final product. I also have to thank Lake Superior College in Duluth, MN, in particular Kent Richards, Marlise Riffel, and Theresa Leopold, who I worked with during the data collection process.

I was very fortunate to have started my masters program with a great group of peers and many of whom I count as friends today. We all came to rely on one another when the going was tough and for one another's friendship while going through the usual struggles as graduate students. In particular, I want to recognize Jessie Sullivan, Ashley Crawford, and Lacey Boston for their contributions towards the completion of my thesis.

I have been fortunate to have had many teachers who have been an inspiration to me for many years now. I want to thank Marlise Riffel for sparking my passion for sociology many years ago while I was a student at Lake Superior College. This passion continued while I was a student of Dr. Michael Ball and Dr. Marshall Johnson at UW-Superior and continued at MSU-Mankato where I had the privilege of studying under many great scholars in our shared discipline. I also want to thank Sue Smith for believing that I could get through my masters degree and encouraged me to finish "that darn thesis!"

Last, but certainly not least, I want to thank my family and my friends back home. Without my friends and family in my corner throughout this process; I would never have gotten through all of the struggles and challenges thrown my way for the last several years. This journey would not have been possible without their love, encouragement, and support (emotional and even financial) and for that I am truly blessed!

Finally, I want to say that the impact of all these individuals on my life has made me the person I am today and I am truly thankful to have had such positive influences and individuals who have believed in me my entire life, for no man risks the adventure alone.

ABSTRACT

Richard Charles Gehrke, "'Get Tough on Juvenile Criminals': An Examination of Punitiveness and Punitive Attitudes. " Thesis Master of Arts in Sociology, Minnesota State University, Mankato, MN, May, 2016

This quantitative study surveyed college students (n=111), currently attending a community college in northeastern Minnesota, regarding whether juveniles should receive the same due process rights as adults, what the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be, whether juveniles charged with serious offenses should be tried as adults, and whether juveniles convicted of committing a serious offense should be sentenced as adults. Utilizing two competing theoretical frameworks, the researcher hypothesized that students who self-identify with a conservative political ideology would be more punitive than students who self-identify with a liberal political ideology. The researcher's second hypothesis was that students who are fearful of being victimized would be more punitive than students who are less fearful of being victimized. Finally, various demographic variables were examined to understand their impact on punitiveness. The results tended to show support for the first hypothesis that punitiveness is impacted by a student's political ideology. The results showed no support for the second hypothesis that punitiveness is impacted by fear of victimization. These findings help to give further insight into public opinion about juvenile delinquency and how juveniles should be punished for committing serious offenses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Prior to the twentieth century, a separate juvenile justice system did not exist in the United States; juvenile delinquents, runaways, truants, and neglected children were treated no differently than adults in their situation. Treatment of juveniles was similar in England. Juveniles received the same sentence as an adult even if it meant the penalty of death (Siegel and Welsh 2012). The movement for the creation of a separate juvenile court system in the United States came about through anger and the work of The Child Savers (Siegel and Welsh, 2012; Hine, 1999).

Hine (1999) describes the experiences of Benjamin Lindsey who established one of the first juvenile courts in Denver, CO in 1900. Lindsey had been assigned to represent two young men accused of burglary and were housed in quarters described by Lindsey as a cage. In this cage, the two young men were found to be playing poker with a horse thief and a safecracker. These two young men had been housed in the same quarters as the older, more criminal, adults for some time. Lindsey's outrage led to his work in creating and presiding over one of the first juvenile courts in the United States (Hine 1999). With the large number of immigrant children who arrived on our nation's shores in the mid-nineteenth century came a concern and recognition that children were not simply the same as adults; rather, they are a special group in need of protection by the state. This group of concerned adults became known as The Child Savers.

The goals of The Child Savers were to extend governmental supervision over juvenile activities which included vagrancy, truancy, and delinquency. This concern also led to the creation of a new category of offense known as status offenses. Status offenses are offenses, when committed by an adult, would not be criminal. Status offenses, today, include underage smoking and drinking, running away from home, and truancy among others. From now on, the state would act under the doctrine of *Parens patriae* which gave the state the power to act in the best interests of the child. The benevolence of The Child Savers is the subject of debate. For example, critical/conflict scholar Anthony Platt argues that The Child Savers were not as benevolent as they would seem to be; rather, their formation was grounded in self interest in order to implement social control over the

new population arriving on our shores. (Siegel and Welsh 2012)

Platt (1969) furthers his argument "that child saving was a conservative and romantic movement, designed to impose sanctions on conduct unbecoming youth and to disqualify youth from enjoying adult privileges". (p. 21) Platt (1969) credits the Child Saving Movement with bringing attention to "and thus invented, new categories of youthful misbehavior which had been previously unappreciated or had been dealt with on an informal basis". (p. 21)

The efforts of the Child Savers led to the Illinois State Legislature creating the first juvenile court in the United States and also a legal conceptualization of juvenile delinquency. From now on legal distinctions would be made between a child who was neglected and a child who was delinquent. The legislative efforts in the state of Illinois led to passage of similar courts throughout the nation and by 1925 every state created a juvenile court system separate from the adult criminal justice system. The creation of the juvenile justice system in this country was a revolutionary new way of looking at how we treated children who were in need or had committed delinquent acts. The new juvenile justice system was a separate system from the adult criminal justice system. No longer would children be held to the same level of accountability as adults who committed similar actions. The goal of the new system was to steer away from punishing youth. Instead, the primary goal of the juvenile justice system was treatment and rehabilitation. The most consequential aspect of the new system was an abandonment of the procedural rules and safeguards set up to protect the rights of defendants that characterized the adult criminal justice system. The 1920s led to the expansion of the juvenile justice system to include regulation of noncriminal behavior including incorrigibility, truancy from school, and the incarceration of young girls who engaged in sexual behavior. In exchange for moving into the juvenile justice system, juveniles, at that time, would give up many of the constitutional rights afforded to adult defendants by the U.S. Constitution, and this led to trouble for the juvenile justice system in the 1960s. (Siegel and Welsh 2012)

The 1960s saw a series of rapid changes and evolutions within our society and the juvenile justice system was not exempt from these changes. The first change to the juvenile justice system came about as the result of the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Kent v. United States* (1965). As a result of the ruling in this case, juveniles now had the

same due process rights as an adult and including being allowed the right to legal counsel. The second change in the system came about as the result of the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling *In re Gault* (1967). According to Siegel and Welsh (2012) this case gave juveniles certain due process rights which included "notice of the charges with respect to their timeliness and specificity, right to counsel, right to confrontation and cross-examination, privilege against self-incrimination, right to a transcript of the trial record, and right to appellate review" (p. 483). While giving juveniles the same constitutional rights afforded to defendants in the adult criminal justice system appeared beneficial, the changes made to the juvenile justice system fundamentally transformed the role of the system. The juvenile justice system was no longer viewed as an informal system acting in the best interests of the child. Now, the juvenile justice system was characterized as a mini adult system without all of the constitutional safeguards and protections afforded to those in the adult system. The changes led some legal scholars, Feld (1993), to call for the outright abolition of the juvenile justice system because it became a flawed system no longer operating on its original intent. (Siegel and Welsh 2012)

According to Kappeler et al. (2000) "if the legislative prescriptions of politicians, the incessant chatter of talk show costs, and the clamor of community leaders is to be believed, U.S. society is under siege by an army of violent juvenile criminals" (p. 175). Bishop describes an uptick "in youth violence in the 1960s and 1970s that put the problem of youth crime squarely on the nation's radar screen. After a brief period of stabilization in the early 1980s, juvenile crime-especially drug crime and urban gun violence-increased at unprecedented rates" (p 653). Kappeler et al. (2000) explain that even though juvenile crime appeared to increase in the 1980s, by the 1994 juvenile crime began to decrease; just as our nation's policymakers and the media began to pay attention to the hot topic of juvenile crime. Kappeler et al. (2000) describe the 1990s where a misperception of a juvenile crime wave became an increased concern with numerous reports of youth violence being reported by the media, and Bishop (2006) concurs that "the media provided heavy and often sensationalized coverage, contributing to a climate of fear" (p. 653). Outrage by members of the general population over this mythological juvenile crime wave led our nation's policymakers to draft new punitive measures for treating convicted juveniles. Bishop (2006) states that "in the last 30 years, legislatures

throughout the United States have instituted a series of reforms that redefined the purposes of juvenile courts and exposed young offenders to a variety of harsh punishments" (p. 653). The consequences of this short lived juvenile crime wave still live on to this day in the United States. Bishop (2006) discusses these significant changes that included amending "juvenile codes to endorse the goals of punishment and protection of public safety, expanded provisions to transfer youths to the jurisdiction of the criminal courts, created blended sentencing options that carry sentences that sometimes extend well into the adult years, and adopted offense-based determinate and mandatory minimum sentencing" (p. 653).

Our nation's policymakers drafted and approved these measures on the belief that the public desired stronger legislation. Policymakers believed that our nation wanted to move away from a system based on the idea of rehabilitation to a system that treats juveniles like adults. The phrase "adult crime, adult time" became associated with the advent of new punitive measures for treating juveniles who broke the law. Yet, the question remains: do members of the public actually support abandoning our tradition of giving these juveniles a second chance at being rehabilitated, or do they prefer to treat them like the adults we believe them to be? (Kappeler et al. 2000; Bishop 2006).

Nagin et al. (2006) state, "accurately gauging the public's support for alternative responses to juvenile offending is important, because policy makers often justify expenditures for punitive juvenile justice reforms on the basis of popular demand for tougher policies" (p. 627). Baron and Hartnagel (1996) explain that "there is little published research on public opinion regarding juvenile justice issues" (p. 191).

The current study examines college students' attitudes regarding the legal processing of juveniles as adults and sentencing juveniles to serve their sentences in adult prisons. While most research has typically focused on members of the general public and their thoughts and opinions on this subject, the current study will focus on college students. Payne and Chappell (2008) make a strong case for using student samples in criminological research. Their first argument is that researchers have long used students in samples in psychological research, therefore why should that not extend to criminological research? For example, we typically see students in samples studying opinions of criminological issues. As the current study is a survey to examine the

attitudes of trying and sentencing juveniles as adults, studying college students is appropriate.

Payne and Chapell (2008) explains that most of the research that is conducted on attitudes regarding criminological issues is used to compare the opinions of students majoring in criminal justice system with students who are not majoring in criminal justice. Finally, the benefits of using student samples in criminological studies include: students are an easily accessible population, student samples save time and money, it is possible to see patterns of change in opinions over time, students are also people, students are a reflection of our nation's culture, students are also very close to the age category of those most likely to be involved in crime and deviance, and it is a learning experience about the research process for students (Payne and Chappell 2008).

Also, the specific reason prompting the current study on college students is rooted in my firsthand experiences assisting juvenile delinquency courses and teaching juvenile delinquency. Prior to these experiences, I believed most college students would have similar attitudes as I when I was a freshman in college. I thought they would be more sympathetic towards juvenile offenders as they are not mini-adults as we like to believe they are. I was surprised at how punitive and harsh these students tended to be, especially for the most severe juvenile offenders which often involved homicide. Therefore, the current study focuses on surveying college students and their attitudes regarding trying and sentencing juveniles as adults.

This thesis will first cover the theoretical explanations that will be utilized in the current study. The second chapter will cover the literature review which focuses on public opinion on issues related to the juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquency from members of the general population and then moves into the relevant research with college students as the population studied. The third section will outline the research questions and hypotheses that will be tested in the current study. The fourth section will outline the methodology that will be used in the current study. The fifth section will present the findings of the current study. The sixth section will discuss the findings of the current study. The seventh and final section will be the conclusion with a focus on the implications of the current study for society and for future research.

Theory

This study utilized two competing theoretical frameworks to explain punitive attitudes regarding juvenile delinquency and the juvenile justice system. Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) theorize that punitive attitudes are influenced by an individual's political ideology and a fear of victimization when combined with other independent variables. Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) believe that those who identify as a conservative are more likely to be punitive; whereas, those who identify as being a liberal are less likely to be punitive. Furthermore, Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) believe that the more fearful an individual is of being victimized; the more likely they are to be punitive. The less fearful an individual is of being victimized, the less likely they are to be punitive.

Political Ideology

Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) theorize that punitive attitudes can be explained by an individual's political ideology. They base their ideas on the work of Schiengold (1984). Schiengold believes there are three different political ideologies relevant to the study of punitive attitudes. These ideologies are hard-line conservative, moderately conservative, and liberal.

Schiengold's (1984) theory of political ideology, and the influence it has on punitive attitudes, holds that a hard-line conservative would believe criminals act out of free will and they need to be punished. Furthermore, when an individual does break the law, that individual needs to be punished harshly in order to pay for their actions. When we punish offenders harshly for their actions, they will not go out and commit the same criminal acts again. In addition to being punished and punished harshly, a hard-line conservative would believe that procedural safeguards are for law abiding citizens and they are not in place for those who willfully choose to violate the law and prey on innocent victims. A hard-line conservative would not believe that social factors are the causation of crime since many individuals face similar social factors and do not break the law. Denial of social factors is rooted in the conservative belief that committing a criminal act is the result of free will, and no other explanation for breaking the law is adequate.

Schiengold (1984) believes that individuals who identify with a liberal political ideology have significantly different opinions from hard-line conservatives. A liberal

would believe crime is the result of societal forces that are beyond the control of any particular individual. The examples Schiengold (1984) provides include growing up in poverty, schools that do not have adequate resources to provide for its students, changes in the family structure, a lack of good paying jobs, the opportunities to economically prosper, etc. Liberals would believe, since crime is the result of social forces that are beyond individuals control, individuals are not solely responsible for their actions and do not commit acts completely out of free will. As a result of these mitigating circumstances, liberals would not support harsh sentences like hard-line conservatives support. Indeed, liberals would believe that we need to address the social factors that cause individuals to break the law.

Moderate conservatives take a middle of the road approach to crime and how we punish criminals. A moderate conservative would believe a hard-line conservative is too punitive; furthermore, they believe a liberal focuses too much on the correlates of crime and believes public policy alone cannot solve these societal factors. Schiengold (1984) believes a moderate conservative takes a cost-benefit analysis when looking at crime. A moderate conservative would believe in consistent punishment for those who choose to break the law; furthermore, a moderate conservative would believe society needs to increase legitimate opportunities for individuals in order to prevent them from becoming criminals.

One of the noticeable problems with the theoretical framework that Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) use is it does not specifically mention juvenile delinquency and/or the juvenile justice system. They only discuss the criminal justice system and adult offenders. Therefore, since the theory only discusses the adult system and offenders, the question remains whether or not the theory would work when it comes to punitive attitudes about the juvenile justice system and juvenile offenders. Could the theory be expanded to incorporate the juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquents, or would the theory not apply to the juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquents? If the theory of Langworthy and Whitehead can be expanded to incorporate the juvenile justice system and juvenile offenders, would the offense committed by a juvenile play a factor in the perceived severity of punishment necessary?

If the theory of Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) holds to be true for the

juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquents, it would be expected that a student in my research project that self identifies as being a hard-line conservative or moderate conservative to hold the view that crime is the result of an individual choosing to carry out a delinquent act. Since a juvenile has made the choice to carry out a delinquent act, that juvenile must be punished, and they must be punished harshly. Furthermore, the theory may also be expanded to say that the goal of the juvenile justice system should be to punish and not rehabilitate juvenile offenders, especially for those juvenile offenders who commit serious delinquent acts. Even though Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) do not explore the juvenile justice system, their theory would suggest conservatives take a get tough approach with juvenile offenders and that the age of the offender and other societal forces are not mitigating factors.

In keeping with Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and Schiengold's (1984) theoretical explanation, it would be expected that a student who self identifies as being liberal to believe that a juvenile offender does not have free will in choosing to partake in delinquent acts, therefore, they should not be punished for their actions. A student who self identifies as liberal would believe the juvenile justice system should not be tough on juvenile delinquents. The goal of the juvenile justice system should be rehabilitation and prevention rather than punishment, and procedural safeguards need to be in place to protect the rights of juvenile offenders.

Finally, the theory suggests that a student who self identifies as a moderate conservative would take a middle of the road approach between the two polar opposites of beliefs when it comes to political ideology and punitive attitudes. The theory suggests a moderate conservative would be more likely to be in the middle when it comes to punitive attitudes and would believe we should not be too punitive, yet we should not let juvenile offenders off with just a warning for committing delinquent acts. A moderate conservative would believe we need punishment and rehabilitation when it comes to working with juvenile delinquents in the juvenile justice system. A moderate conservative would believe juveniles have free will; however societal forces also play an important role in choosing whether or not to break the law.

Fear of Victimization

Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) also theorize an individual's fear of

victimization leads to punitive attitudes. Langworhy and Whitehead (1986) base their ideas on the work of Sheley (1985). Sheley (1985) makes a connection that the recent increases we have seen in punitive attitudes are the direct result of people being more fearful that they will be victimized. He believes an individual will be more punitive towards criminal offenders if they are more fearful of being victimized. Alternatively, if an individual does not fear being the victim of a criminal act, they will be less punitive towards criminal offenders. As Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) suggest, people recently have become more focused on criminals and punishing criminals than they are about the reasons why people commit criminal acts. Sheley's (1985) theory does not address the question whether increased focus on punishing criminals applies to both the criminal justice system and the juvenile justice system or only the criminal justice system. It could be possible that being fearful of victimization only applies to adult offenders and not juvenile offenders. Similarly, a fear of victimization may lead to punitive attitudes towards any criminal offender whether they are 4, 14, or 40, and the age of the offender does affect punitive attitudes.

Utilizing the theoretical framework outlined above by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and Sheley (1985), it would be expected that a student in my research project who reports being fearful of crime to exhibit punitive attitudes towards juvenile offenders and desire to hold them accountable for their actions. Examining attitudes toward juvenile punishment would expand upon the original theoretical ideas of Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and Sheley (1985). A student who reports being fearful of victimization would believe we need to be tough on juvenile offenders, the goal of the juvenile justice system should be to punish and not rehabilitate, and there are too many safeguards in place within the juvenile justice system to protect the constitutional rights of juvenile offenders. Alternatively, a student who reports they are not fearful of being victimized would be less likely to support punitive sentences and measures for juvenile offenders, would support rehabilitation over punishment, and believe safeguards should be in place to protect the constitutional rights of juvenile offenders.

In the current study, I tested whether or not the theoretical explanation of Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) can be applied to college students as well. We already know from their research that it can be used to explain punitive attitudes among members

of the general population; however, can this explanation be expanded to include a specific subgroup of the general population such as college students? Also, testing both theoretical explanations would show whether or not the theories hold true for the juvenile justice system and juvenile offenders as it does for the criminal justice system and adult offenders. If the theoretical explanations for punitive attitudes by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986), Schiengold (1984), and Sheley (1985) hold true with college students, we would expect to see political ideology and beliefs, personal victimization, and a fear of victimization as having an impact on punitive attitudes about the juvenile justice system and juvenile offenders.

Chapter II
Literature Review

General Population and the Juvenile Justice System

Criminologists have recently given increased attention to public opinion about crime, criminal justice, and the juvenile justice system. This review of the literature will focus exclusively on the general public attitudes about the juvenile justice system and juvenile offenders. The previous studies focused heavily on the severity of sentences for juvenile offenders and whether juveniles should be rehabilitated or punished.

Skovron, et al. (1989) used a telephone study to assess the support of Midwestern residents for the use of capital punishment for juveniles. The results showed a large number of residents in the Midwest did not support the death penalty for juveniles above the age of 14 who were convicted of murder. Furthermore, the results showed there was far less support for capital punishment for juveniles compared with support for capital punishment for adults convicted of murder. Finally, the results of the study showed those residents who believed that rehabilitation programs tend to be effective in dealing with juveniles were least likely to support capital punishment for juveniles. The variables used in the study included effectiveness of rehabilitation programs, the respondent's age, the respondent's gender, the educational level of the respondent, and religiosity (Skovron, et al., 1989). Of all the dependent variables Skovron examined, the only dependent variable to have a significant effect on the independent variable was the variable for the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs.

Schwartz, et al. (1993), in their study, took a closer look at the data from a national public opinion survey conducted in 1991 regarding people's juvenile crime and juvenile justice attitudes. In particular, they analyzed which demographic variables correlate with increased punitive attitudes towards juvenile crime and offenders. For this study, researchers conceptualized punitive attitudes as "the legal processing of juveniles in adult criminal courts and sentencing of juveniles to adult prisons" (Schwartz, et al. 1993:11). The independent variables researchers studied included respondent's age, years of formal education, employment status, race, fear of violent crime victimization, sex, number of children, and the multiplicative effect of race and parental status. The researchers had several hypotheses. The first hypothesis was that with an initial increase

in age, there would be a decrease in the level of support for punitive measures; however, after a certain age support for punitive measures increases. The second hypothesis was adults who have children would be less likely to support punitive measures than adults who do not have children. The third hypothesis was parents who are African-American would be less likely to support punitive measures than parents from other racial/ethnic backgrounds.

The results of the study by Schwartz, et al. (1993) showed men are more likely to support punitive policies than women, and this was true for all of the offenses examined in the study. Secondly, if an individual is fearful of becoming the victim of a violent crime, they are more likely to hold punitive attitudes. As the level of fear of victimization increases, the level of support for punitive policies increases. Individuals surveyed who had children were less likely to support punitive policies for juvenile crime and offenders. Whether or not you are an African-American correlated with punitive attitudes; African-Americans were less likely to have punitive attitudes. These two findings lend support to the researchers' hypotheses; however the researchers were surprised that the data did not support their third and final hypothesis: African-American parents are less likely to have punitive attitudes than parents of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. Finally, the data showed punitive attitudes against juvenile crime and juvenile offenders tend to formulate around middle age.

As shown by Schwartz, et al. (1993), fear of being the victim of a violent crime has an influence on punitive attitudes as theorized by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and provides a portion of the theoretical framework used in my proposed study. Of interest to my research, the results of Schwartz, et al. (1993) show punitive attitudes do not begin to take fruition until around middle age, therefore the young age of my study population poses potential issues for my research questions. If punitive attitudes do not develop until middle age, will discernible relationships exist in the respondents' attitudes?

Grasmick and McGill (1994) examined the idea religious beliefs influence punitive attitudes towards juvenile offenders. The researcher's hypothesized individuals who have a literal interpretation of the Bible will believe crime is the result of dispositional factors and these dispositional factors will lead to punitive attitudes towards

juvenile offenders. The researchers operationalized dispositional factors as the characteristics of the offender and situational factors as the offender's environment. Researcher's controlled for political affiliation since those who tend to identify themselves as Republican also tend to be conservative Christians. Researchers also controlled for age, education, and sex since other studies have shown these demographic variables to also have an effect on punitiveness. Data from the study showed, rather convincingly, their hypothesis was supported; individuals with a literal interpretation of the Bible had more punitive attitudes.

Moon, et al. (2000) studied residents in the state of Tennessee to investigate the support for rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. The respondents of the survey believed rehabilitation needs to be an important part of the juvenile correctional system. Respondents also strongly supported community based intervention programs and intervention programs to prevent juvenile crime. The respondents preferred these two options to imprisoning juvenile offenders. Researchers found most respondents favor the idea that the juvenile correctional system needs to have multiple correctional goals rather than one goal; thus, the results showed most respondents believed imprisonment should include goals of rehabilitation, punishment, and incapacitating juvenile offenders. The authors argued the idea of rehabilitating juvenile offenders should not be abandoned and needs to be an option along with punishing juvenile offenders within the juvenile correctional system.

Applegate and Davis (2006) examined how the residents of Florida feel juvenile murderers should be punished. Using a random sample, researchers examined how the offender's characteristics, details about the offense, and the perception of the offender's maturity, have on preference for punishment of juvenile murderers. Applegate and Davis suspected people prefer more punitive sentences when the juvenile is older, when the juvenile shows a higher level of maturity, if the juvenile was male and not female, and if the juvenile has a prior record. The researchers also predicted that support for punitive sentences would be greater for juveniles who commit particularly heinous murders. Finally, they suggest a relationship between support for more punitive sentences based upon the respondent's perception of how mature all teenagers are as a group and not just juvenile murderers. Researchers controlled for respondent's age, gender, race, level of

education, and whether they had children or not. Researchers also asked respondents about their political ideology. Finally, researchers asked whether they held fundamentalist religious views or not.

The results of the Applegate and Davis (2006) study found the public is more likely to favor short term sentences of incarceration and/or less punitive sentences for offenders in most cases, however this changes when the offense committed has been murder. In cases of juveniles who committed murder, the public tends to favor punitive sentencing against that offender. The results of the study also showed younger respondents were more likely to support sentences of life without parole or capital punishment for juveniles who have committed murder; also, those who identify themselves as conservative were more likely to support similar sentences. Further results showed age had a factor on preferred sentence with older respondents preferring a sentence of either probation or no punishment compared to younger respondents. Race also has an influence on preferred punishment; white respondents favor tougher sentences than non-white respondents. Their hypothesis regarding the maturity of teenagers in general was not supported. Instead, the results suggest that respondents who believed teenagers are more mature today than in the past are more likely to support less punitive measures against juvenile offenders. Finally, as the severity of the offense increases, the support for punitive sentencing increases.

As shown by Applegate and Davis (2006), political ideology has an influence on punitive attitudes as theorized by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and informs the theoretical framework used in my proposed study. The results also showed most people will typically favor less punitive sentences for juvenile offenders with the exception of juveniles who have committed murder. For juvenile murderers, most people will typically support a punitive sentence of either life without parole or capital punishment. The U.S. Supreme Court's rulings in 2005 with *Roper v. Simmons,* in 2010 with *Graham v. Florida,* and in 2012 with *Miller v. Alabama* address the question of whether or not teenagers have the same level of maturity as adult offenders. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled in two cases that teenagers do not have the same level of maturity as adults and has ruled against capital punishment for juveniles, life without parole for juveniles convicted of non-homicidal offenses, and now with *Miller v. Alabama* life without parole for

juveniles who commit homicide.

Piquero and Steinberg (2010) conducted a study in four states throughout the United States (Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington) to assess whether or not members of the general public were more supportive of rehabilitation or incarceration of juvenile offenders. Respondents were randomly selected to respond to two different proposals. The first proposal would increase rehabilitative services for serious juvenile offenders without increasing the time they would be incarcerated. Respondents were also informed that rehabilitation programs lead to a 30 percent reduction in juvenile crime. The second proposal was a proposal which would increase the amount of time a juvenile offender would be incarcerated for serious juvenile offenses, but there would no addition of rehabilitative services. Respondents who were selected for the incarceration prompt were also informed that incarceration of one additional year leads to a 30 percent decrease in juvenile crime. Upon reading each scenario, respondents were then asked if they would be willing to pay an additional $100 in taxes to make such a change in the law. Respondents who answered yes were then asked a follow-up question where the amount in additional taxes was increased to $200. Respondents who answered no were asked the same question; however, the amount in additional taxes was decreased to $50.

The results of the study showed respondents who received the rehabilitation prompt were more likely to support paying higher taxes to fund such a proposal compared with respondents who received the prompt to increase the amount of time for incarceration of juvenile offenders. Respondents who received the incarceration proposal were not as likely to support paying additional taxes to reduce juvenile crime through increased incarceration. Piquero and Steinberg (2010) argue the results of their study showed members of the general public are more likely to support, and fund, rehabilitation services for juvenile offenders compared to members of the general public who support incarcerating juvenile offenders.

College Students and the Criminal Justice System

While a considerable amount of research exists on what members of the general public think about the criminal justice system; little research exists as to what college students think about the criminal justice system. Farnworth, et al. (1998) examined the beliefs of college students about topics concerning the criminal justice system. Dozier

(2009) examined factors which influences a student's decision to support punishment or rehabilitation for criminal offenders. Falco (2008) assesses the differences in opinion between students majoring in criminology and students majoring in a subject other than criminology.

Farnworth, et al. (1998) examined college students' attitudes on specific topics within the criminal justice system. The topics included support for the use of capital punishment, other sentencing options for criminals, and the United States' war on drugs. The authors of the study hypothesized that as students' progress through college, they will not have the same punitive attitudes and beliefs as they did when they first began college. The second hypothesis was the relationship will be less apparent with students who are majoring in criminal justice than students majoring in other academic disciplines. The third hypothesis was criminal justice students at all grade levels will hold more punitive views and beliefs than students majoring in other academic disciplines of the same class rank. The fourth and final hypothesis was students majoring in criminal justice who have experience working in the system will be more punitive in their attitudes and beliefs compared to students majoring in criminal justice without experience working in the system. Their results showed support for their hypothesis that college has a liberalizing effect, which leads to a decrease in punitive attitudes and beliefs within students as they progress through college. Their findings suggested seniors have less punitive attitudes and beliefs compared to freshmen. The authors found weak support for their third hypothesis and did not find support for their fourth and final hypothesis.

In a rebuttal to the work of Farnworth, et al. (1998), Eskridge takes issue with the conclusions that Farnworth, et al. (1998) reach. He argued the data did not support the conclusions reached by the researchers, that the college experience has a liberalizing effect on its students. He also criticized the methodology used for the study. Eskridge (1999) argued one group in the study (college freshmen) had yet to receive the assumed treatment (college experience and education), but only one group received the treatment (college seniors). Eskridge (1999) pointed out that many college freshmen do not make it to their senior year, and he offered an alternative explanation for the results found by Farnworth, et al. (1998). His explanation was the students who made it to their senior year in college were students who were more liberal when they began college and they

have held on to their liberal views throughout college and the experience did not affect them. The students who were more conservative in their views and beliefs at the start of college may have dropped out before they reached their senior rank. Eskridge (1999) also questioned how Farnworth, et al. (1998) operationalized the variable of college experience as it was not clearly defined. He also suggested factors external to college may be responsible for the study's results such as age, gender, race and ethnicity, employment status, etc.

Dozier (2009) conducted a random sample of Texas State University undergraduate students which assessed the factors that influence their willingness to support rehabilitation or punishment of criminal offenders. Using a punishment-rehabilitation continuum, Dozier assessed student's willingness to support rehabilitation or punishment for the six most common criminal acts: "robbery, rape, molestation, burglary, drug sale, and drug possession" (p. 1). Dozier (2009) examined the influences of fear of victimization, victimization, political ideology, gender, academic level, the geographic location where student grew up, annual family income, race/ethnicity, and the hours of crime shows that were watched in a week.

Levels of support for rehabilitation or punishment changed based on the offense, with lesser offenses receiving more support for rehabilitation and more serious offenses receiving more support for punishment. Also, Dozier (2009) discovered more support for rehabilitation by graduate students than freshman and sophomores who tended to support more punitive measures against criminal offenders. The most significant indicator of support for punishment as opposed to rehabilitation was with political ideology. The more conservative a student, the more likely they were to support punishment as opposed to rehabilitation. Dozier's (2009) findings also suggested that women are less punitive than male students with women more likely to support rehabilitation and men more likely to support punishment. Race/ethnicity was a significant factor in Dozier (2009) for drug offenses with African American and Hispanic/Latino students being more punitive with drug offenses than white students. Dozier's (2009)'s findings suggest support for the idea that fear of victimization influences support for sentencing with students who are more fearful supporting sentencing as opposed to rehabilitation. The results of Dozier (2009)'s study found a lack of support for household income, geographic location, victimization,

and the amount of crime shows a student watches a week as significantly impacting their views on sentencing or rehabilitation.

Falco (2008) assessed whether there was a significant difference in levels of punitiveness between criminology students and non-criminology students when it comes to sentencing and punishing criminals. Falco (2008) also addressed a number of other demographic characteristics that may significantly influence the opinions of college students. She considered that sex and the geographic location of students may have a significant impact on their opinions. Falco (2008) also examined attitudinal variables that have been shown to influence the opinions of college students, and these attitudinal variables are important because they relate to the current study. These attitudinal variables include: "political ideology, political party identification, religiosity, victimization, fear of crime, and causal attributions" (Falco, 2008:49-50).

The results of Falco's (2008) research showed that students who are majoring in criminology were found to be less punitive as opposed to students who were not majoring in criminology. One of Falco's (2008) other significant findings is that students who were in freshman and sophomore level classes held more punitive attitudes as opposed to students in junior and senior level classes. Another significant result from her research has major implications for the study that I propose to carry out. Falco's (2008) research suggested that students who identify with a liberal political ideology are less likely to be punitive as opposed to students who identify with a conservative political ideology. Further results of her research suggested that there is no support for the idea that students who have a greater fear of victimization are more likely to be punitive than students who have a lower fear of victimization. Furthermore, there is no significant support for the idea that prior victimization influences punitive attitudes among college students according to Falco's (2008) research. Falco (2008) provided those who are interested in the teaching of criminal justice and juvenile delinquency with a comprehensive examination of several variables and attitudinal factors that may have an influence on levels of punitive attitudes when it comes to the sentencing and punishment of criminal offenders.

College Students and the Juvenile Justice System

The literature most relevant to my proposed study is research analyzing the

attitudes and opinions of college students regarding the juvenile justice system and the sentencing of juveniles. Although, there are previous studies that have examined this important topic, little research was found that examines punitive attitudes and the juvenile justice system. Most of the studies examine the attitudes and opinions of college students about support for different intervention programs. Also, a preliminary study of college students researched their opinions about the juvenile justice system, therefore there is room for more research to be conducted to further examine this important topic.

In a survey study by Perelman and Clements (2009), researchers examined how college students felt about different intervention programs/strategies for juvenile offenders. "The results indicated that participants rated three popular but empirically unsupported (get tough) programs as being equally effective as four empirically validated treatments" (Perelman and Clements 2009:184). The research also showed a relationship existed between attitudes and how respondents ranked program effectiveness. For example, respondents who supported rehabilitation as a goal were more likely to rate empirically backed interventions as effective. Respondents who supported punishment as a goal were more likely to support empirically unsupported get tough programs.

The study by Perelman and Clements (2009) examined what college students think should be the goal of the juvenile justice system and whether this correlates with support for empirically supported or unsupported intervention programs and strategies. Up to this point, there has been little research examining opinions of college students about the juvenile justice system and its policies. Benekos, et al. (2002) conducted the only previous study to better understand college students and their opinions of juvenile justice policy. The study population was selected from three different colleges, ranging from a small private college to a mid-sized university. Respondents included students from all four undergraduate class ranks. The researchers also analyzed the answers of respondents with demographic variables consisting of class rank, race, gender, major, political party, and religious affiliation.

The results of the Benekos, et al. (2002) study found most students strongly agree or agree that school violence was increasing. There were no significant differences based on class rank with the responses to this question. Female students are more likely to respond that school violence is getting worse compared with male students, and the

difference is statistically significant. As it relates to zero tolerance policies, most students strongly believe zero-tolerance policies need to be enforced in order to prevent school violence before it happens. Students who believe school violence is increasing are more likely to support enforcement of zero tolerance policies compared with students who do not.

There did not appear to be any relationship between class rank or major and support for zero-tolerance policies, however females, compared to males, are more likely to support enforcement of zero-tolerance policies. The final results of the study suggested students are less supportive of random drug testing of students in schools than enforcement of zero-tolerance policies. The results of the final question did show the students who are more likely to support enforcement of zero-tolerance policies are also more likely to support random drug testing of students. Furthermore, students who believe school violence was increasing are also more supportive of random drug testing. Generally, the results showed little differences between the three institutions; however, there were a few differences between the three institutions. The students at Institution C were more likely to strongly agree or agree that school violence appeared to be worsening, support zero-tolerance policies, and to disagree or strongly disagree with drug testing. The researchers argued that caution must be exercised when concluding differences exist between the three institutions due to the use of a small number of institutions.

Benekos, et al. (2002) clearly stated in their abstract that their research is a preliminary study analyzing the attitudes of college students toward juvenile justice policy; however, in essence, the study merely focused on college issues and delinquency but ignored broader juvenile justice issues. Indeed, the authors even point out "this paper reviews trends in youth violence and reports on some of the attitudes of college respondents toward policies to reduce school violence" (Benekos, et al. 2002:274). I make the argument that the study by Benekos, et al. (2002) does not go far enough in examining the attitudes and opinions that college students may have about juvenile delinquency and the juvenile justice system. Furthermore, Benekos, et al. (2002) did not examine the effect of political ideology, fear of victimization, and other demographic characteristics that may be related to a student's opinion about juvenile delinquency and

the juvenile justice system.

Of particular interest to this research, political ideology, in most of the research (Langworthy and Whitehead, 1986; Applegate and Davis, 2006; Falco, 2008), had a significant association with punitive attitudes. Respondents with a conservative political ideology are more likely to have punitive attitudes than respondents who have a liberal political ideology (Langworthy and Whitehead, 1986; Applegate and Davis, 2006; Falco, 2008) The prior research suggests strong support for Langworthy and Whithead's (1986) theory that political ideology influences punitive attitudes. Few studies have tested for fear of victimization as correlated with punitiveness which is of particular importance to this research as well. Among those studies that have examined fear of victimization; the results have been more mixed with Schwartz (1993) finding support for this theoretical idea while Baron and Hartnagel (1996) and Falco (2008) failed to find support for this theoretical idea.

From previous research, we know quite a lot about what members of the general public feel about the juvenile justice system, and we know a lot about what college students think about the criminal justice system; however the field of research has not been developed as deeply in the area of college students' attitudes regarding the juvenile justice system. Very little research exists which examines what college students think about the juvenile justice system. It is quite clear there is a lack of research studying college student's attitudes of the juvenile justice system.

Based on a comprehensive review of the preexisting literature on the subject of my thesis, I conducted my study utilizing the theoretical framework presented by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) that examined if a relationship existed between students' political ideology, students' fear of victimization and punitive attitudes about juvenile delinquency and the juvenile justice system, and the influence of other demographic characteristics.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Research Questions/Hypotheses

My first research question asks: does a student's political ideology influence their opinions of the juvenile justice system? I hypothesize that students who identify with a conservative political ideology will be more likely to hold punitive attitudes about the juvenile justice system. Furthermore, I hypothesize that students who identify with a liberal political ideology will be less likely to hold punitive attitudes about the juvenile justice system. The null hypothesis would be that there is no significant difference between students' political ideology and having a punitive attitude about the juvenile justice system.

My second research question is: does a fear of victimization lead to punitive attitudes about the juvenile justice system among college students? I hypothesize that students who are fearful of being victimized will be more likely to hold punitive attitudes about the juvenile justice than students who are not fearful about being victimized. The null hypothesis would be that there is no significant difference between students' political ideology and having a punitive attitude about the juvenile justice system.

My third and final research question is: which demographic characteristics and attitudes have an influence on punitive attitudes? In addition to a students' political ideology, the following demographic characteristics will be examined to see if there is a relationship with punitive attitudes: sex, age, race/ethnicity, class level, and the geographic location of where respondents were born. The attitudinal variables that will be examined are religious affiliation, level of religiosity, and the political party identification. All of these demographic characteristics and attitudes were shown to have an influence, either positive or negative, on punitive attitudes according to a review of the literature on the topic of punitive attitudes and the juvenile justice system.

Procedure/Data Collection

The current study implemented a quantitative study using survey research to answer my research questions and hypotheses. Babbie (2005) describes "survey research as the best method available to the social researcher who is interested in collecting original data for describing a population too large to observe directly" (p. 252).

Furthermore, Babbie (2005) explains that "surveys are excellent vehicles for measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population" (p. 252). The research project carried out is related to the topic of college students and their attitudes towards the juvenile justice system and its' policies, therefore a survey is appropriate for my research project.

The survey distributed to students consisted of a cover letter that introduced the student to the survey and addressed the issue of informed consent. *(See Appendix A: Informed Consent and Appendix B: Survey)* The survey proceeded to the questions that each student was asked to answer and was divided into two parts. In the first section students were asked various demographic questions and questions that were related to the independent variables of political ideology and a fear of victimization. *(See Appendix B: Survey)*

The demographic questions followed the format that was used by Falco (2008) with the exception of the question of race/ethnicity which has come from Farnworth, et al. (1998). Race/ethnicity was a demographic variable not examined in Falco's research, and the question must be included here since it demonstrated a relationship with juvenile justice attitudes in previous studies. Students were asked questions related to the independent variables of political ideology and fear of victimization. The questions that used for political ideology were similar to the questions that were used by Dozier (2009). The first question, related to political ideology, which students were asked to answer was to self-identify the political party that they identify with the most. The second series of questions asked students, using a Likert scale, to indicate their level of agreement with several questions related to their personal opinion of different topics in politics. Finally, students were asked, using a Likert scale, to indicate their level of agreement as to whether they self-identify as a liberal, moderate, or conservative. Students were then asked to answer questions about their fear of victimization and actual victimization. Using a Likert scale, students were asked to indicate how fearful they are of being the victim of each criminal act listed. Each student was asked to answer each how many times they have been the victim of each criminal act listed during the past year. All questions used appear as they were worded in the work of Falco (2008) and Dozier (2009) (*See Appendix D).* Part II of the survey asked each student how strongly they agreed or disagreed with each of the statements provided in order to assess the students'

punitive attitudes about the juvenile justice system. The questions used in this study are adapted from Schwartz (1996) *(See Dependent Variable for Explanation on the Use of Schwartz's Questions)*.

The survey used in my study was distributed to students in sociology classes that were selectively chosen as the sample that would be used for the current study. The decision was made to implement a form of nonprobability sampling described by Babbie (2005) as a purposive sample. Although, a representative, or probability sampling, would have been preferable, a purposive sample was conducted as it would have been too difficult to obtain a representative sample given student privacy issues and access to population information. The decision was made to use students who were enrolled in sociology classes since I was teaching sociology at the time the study was implemented and since it provided me with the easiest access to a group of college students to survey. *(See Appendix A: Informed Consent)*

Students who were selected for participation in the current study received a copy of an informed consent form which needed to be completed at the time they were handed a copy of my survey. The informed consent form I used followed the format used by Falco (2008). Suggestions for modifications were requested by the IRB at MSU-Mankato, and these suggestions for modifications were agreed to. An additional suggestion made by the IRB at MSU-Mankato was to seek a waiver of documentation of consent since the research study presented no more than minimal risk of harm to the subjects (students) who were involved in the study. Therefore, written consent was not necessary. An additional concern addressed by the IRB at MSU-Mankato was that an outside faculty/staff member be present at the time the survey was distributed in order to ensure that students did not feel coerced into participating in the study. This was important since the researcher was the instructor for three of the classes selected for participation in the current study. Students were informed they were under no obligation to participate in the study, there were no consequences for not participating, and they were free to exit the survey at any time with no consequences to them for doing so. Furthermore, students were directed to the principal investigator for the current study, Dr. Paul Prew, if they had concerns over the survey and Dean Barry Ries at MSU-Mankato, the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies. Students were informed that I would not

know what their responses were to any of the questions and to not attach a name to their completed surveys.

Sampling/Participants

For my proposed study, the sampling frame that was used was on-line and face to face sociology classes at Lake Superior College during the spring semester of 2015. I decided to conduct my study at Lake Superior College due to my employment at Lake Superior College as a Part-Time Temporary Instructor in the Sociology Department at the time this study was carried out. This enabled me easier access to a population with whom I was already familiar.

Although, a simple random sample of classes at Lake Superior College would have allowed me to generalize my results about the entire population of students at Lake Superior College; I decided against using a simple random sample of classes. The reason that I decided against a simple random sample of classes was because I was guaranteed complete access and cooperation from my colleagues in the sociology department to survey students in their classes in addition to the classes that I taught at Lake Superior College in the spring semester. The results of my study could be influenced by my decision to only survey students who were enrolled in sociology classes, and the results of this study cannot be used to make generalizations about the entire population of college students at Lake Superior College nor can the results be used to make generalizations about the entire population of college students.

There are many reasons why I chose to use sociology classes as my sampling frame as opposed to using individual students as my sampling frame. Czaja and Blair (2005:189-191) argued there are several benefits by choosing to sample college classes as opposed to individual students at a college or university. The first benefit is a very efficient sampling method. The second benefit is student classes provide the researcher with natural clusters. The third benefit is that you are able to conduct more surveys in the same amount of time as it would take to complete one survey. Despite having several strengths to sampling university classes; there are weaknesses with this choice of sampling. One of the weaknesses is that a student may be absent on the day that a survey is distributed in class. An additional weakness would be not receiving cooperation from the instructor whose class was selected for inclusion in the study; however this weakness

will not impact my study as the sociology instructors in my department agreed to cooperate with the completion of this study.

As mentioned previously, the list for my sampling frame consisted of sociology classes. Since all of the sociology classes at Lake Superior College do not contain a large number of students, no classes were excluded from the master class list due to class size. Large class sizes tend to have "large intraclass correlations that will increase the estimates of variance" (Czaja and Blair 2005:189). The following sociology classes were included in my sampling frame:

Introduction to Sociology (SOC 1111) Sections 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 55, and 56
Criminal Justice and Society (SOC 1114) Section 90
Juvenile Delinquency (SOC 1130) Section 01
Race, Class, and Gender (SOC 1145) Section 55
Patterns of Domestic Violence (SOC 1165) Section 55
Social Problems (SOC 2120) Section 55
People and the Environment (SOC 2123) Section 55

The population that data was collected from was students who were enrolled at Lake Superior College during the 2015 spring semester. Lake Superior College is a two-year community college located in northeastern Minnesota, in the City of Duluth, MN, that offers both technical degrees and liberal arts classes in anticipation of students transferring to a four-year university. The city of Duluth, MN, is located approximately 155 miles northeast of Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area. The population of Duluth is around 85,000. According to the most recently published statistics by Lake Superior College's Office of Accreditation, Research, and Assessment at Lake Superior College: there is a total of 5,185 students. Of the 5,185 students; 41% are full-time students and 59% are part-time students. 56% of enrolled students are female and 44% of enrolled students are male students. 62% of enrolled students at Lake Superior College are classified as traditional students and 38% are classified as non-traditional. 83% of enrolled students at Lake Superior College are classified as Caucasian with the remaining students classified as African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, Native of Hawaii/Pacific Islands, Two or More Races, Non-Resident alien, or the student chose to

not report their race/ethnicity to Lake Superior College. 44% of enrolled students at Lake Superior College are eligible for Pell Grants which is an indicator many students come from lower-income backgrounds (Lake Superior College Fact Book, 2014).

The results of this study could possibly be influenced by choosing to limit the sample to students at Lake Superior College, which is a state-run community college. If I were to include populations from other colleges (i.e. private university, for profit college, state university), the results may differ significantly based upon the type of university or college that a student attends.

Demographic Variables and Attitudinal Variables

Falco (2008) examined several demographic variables and the possible relationship these variables have on the dependent variable of punitiveness. The variables used for my study were: sex, age, race/ethnicity, academic level, whether the student is an international student or not, and the size of town and the geographic region in which the student was primarily raised. All the variables, according to Falco (2008), have been shown to have a possible relationship with levels of punitiveness; therefore all of these variables were also included within my study. I also used a dummy variable for my study which was asking students to report how many hours of television they watched in an average week. The operationalization for each of these variables was similar to how Falco (2008) operationalized each variable.

Similar to Falco (2008) and Dozier (2009) I examined several attitudinal variables as well with my study. The attitudinal variables examined included: political ideology, political party identification, religious affiliation, and how committed a student was to their religious beliefs. All of these variables, according to Falco (2008), have been shown to have a possible relationship with levels of punitiveness. Thus, all of these variables were also included within my study. The operationalization for each variable was similar to how Falco (2008) and Dozier (2009) operationalized each variable.

Independent Variable – Political Ideology Conceptualization and Operationalization

While Langworthy & Whitehead (1986) do not conceptualize political ideology; they do conceptualize "basic values". Their definition of hard-line conservative, moderate conservative, and liberal are based in terms of one's beliefs about crime and punishment and support for spending on social programs in four areas: spending for the poor, health

programs, education, and jobs. This would appear to be a problem with the theoretical framework proposed by Langworthy & Whitehead (1986); therefore, I looked for additional sources in order to conceptualize political ideology. I conceptualize political ideology based upon the work of Dolbeare & Medcalf (1988). Dolbeare & Medcalf (1988) conceptualize conservative political ideology in the United States as an ideology that is "highly individualistic and (a) strict laissez-faire doctrine" (p. 209) While Dolbeare & Medcalf (1988) do not conceptualize what is meant by a "strict laissez-faire doctrine" (p. 209); Kendall (2013) defines laissez-faire as "capitalism based on a lack of government intervention in the marketplace…competition in a free market-place should be the force that regulates prices and establishes workers' wages, rather than the government doing so" (p. 295). Dolbeare & Medcalf (1988) conceptualize a liberal political ideology as "the belief in government intervention in the economy for social purposes and the use of government to provide help for disadvantaged people" (p. 34). Dolbeare & Medcalf did not identify moderate conservatives in their work on political ideologies in the United States. Furthermore, they do not discuss what a political ideology would look like that is in the center of this political spectrum. Since moderate conservatives needs to be conceptualized, in accordance with the theory of Langworthy and Whitehead (1986), I would therefore conceptualize a moderate conservative as a political ideology that would fall between conservative and liberal and does not identify strongly with either of these two political ideologies. An example of a moderate political ideology might be the belief in government intervention as a necessity at times, and the government should provide some help for disadvantaged people, but, there needs to be restrictions and limitations on what kind of help the government provides. I operationalize political ideology on the survey with the following questions based on the survey used by Dozier (2008).

- To which political party do you most closely identify
- Any raise in the federal minimum wage is unnecessary and will hurt small business.
- Congress should propose and the states should approve a constitutional amendment to outlaw abortion

- The death penalty is immoral and should never be used by the government
- The government should cut taxes for citizens even if it means that some government programs will not be funded
- There should be more money in our federal budget for environmental regulations
- Universal healthcare is a fundamental right which government should guarantee for all citizens
- Congress should propose and the states should ratify an amendment to the U.S. Constitution outlawing gay marriage.
- I consider myself to be a liberal
- I consider myself to be a conservative
- It is the responsibility of government to provide assistance to the poor and needy

The one exception to the questions listed above is the inclusion of a question which asks students to answer whether or not they consider themselves to be a moderate. This was not a question used by Dozier (2008), however it would need to be asked in order to stay consistent with the theoretical framework of Langworthy and Whitehead (1986).

The variable of political ideology was examined through the use of four different scales. The first scale that was created was labeled as Lib Scale 1 which incorporated all variables which were correlated with the self-identification variable of Liberal. These variables were: outlaw abortion, death penalty, more money for the environment, health care as a universal right, and the government should provide assistance for the poor. The three variables which were not included in Lib Scale 1 were the political ideology variables related to outlawing gay marriage, increasing the minimum wage, and cutting taxes. These three variables were not included since they were not significantly related with the self-identification variable of liberal. The second scale, which was labeled Lib Scale 2, that was created included all variables discussed above and included the variable for gay marriage. The third scale, which was labeled Liberal Political Scale, included all political ideology variables. To ensure the scale was consistent, questions that required it were recoded. The fourth scale created was a Conservative Scale which included the variables of outlawing abortion and outlawing gay marriage. All other variables did not

have a significant relationship, either positive or negative, with the self-identification variable of Conservative.

Independent Variable – Fear of Victimization

I conceptualized fear of victimization based upon the work of Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and Sheley (1985) as being afraid of being a direct and/or vicarious victim of a criminal offense. Since neither Langworthy and Whitehead or Sheley distinguished between violent and non-violent criminal offenses, I did not distinguish between the two types of criminal offenses in my conceptualization for fear of victimization. To operationalize fear of victimization for each respondent, I included a survey question used in the study by Falco (2008) which asked "on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not fearful at all and 5 being very fearful, how much would you say you fear being the victim of the following crimes?" Respondents were asked to rate their fear of victimization for the following offenses: having your car stolen, having someone break into your house/apartment/dorm, being robbed or mugged on the street, being raped or sexually assaulted, being beaten up or assaulted, and being murdered. Respondents are also asked to "indicate the number of times, if any, that you were a victim of any of the following crimes within the past year." They were asked to indicate the number of times they had been the victim of the following offenses: someone broke into their house/apartment/dorm, had property stolen from their house/apartment/dorm, someone broke into their car, had their wallet pick-pocketed or purse stolen, someone threatening to beat them up on the street/and or robbed you, someone beat them up in a fight that they did not start. Similar to the scales that were created for the independent variable of political ideology, similar scales were created for fear of victimization. The first scale created included being fearful of all the offenses listed above. The second scale created consisted of only property offenses and excluded violent offenses. The third and final scale consisted of only violent offenses and excluded property offenses.

In addition to fear of victimization, I examined whether or not actual victimization was significantly associated with punitive attitudes. I looked at actual victimization as two different variables. The first variable examined victimization as a total sum of the following offenses as listed in the survey instrument I used: someone broke into your house/apartment/dorm, someone stole property from your

house/apartment/dorm, someone broke into your car, someone stole your car, someone pick-pocketed your wallet or stole your purse, someone threatened to beat you up on the street, someone mugged you while walking on the street, and someone beat you up in a fight that you did not start. The second variable examined victimization as a dichotomous variable whereby the student was either the victim of the offenses listed above; or, they were not a victim of the offenses listed above.

Dependent Variable-Punitive Attitudes Conceptualization and Operationalization

For the dependent variable of punitive attitudes, I conceptualized punitive attitudes based on the work of Schwartz et al. (1993). Schwartz et al. (1993) conceptualized punitive attitudes as "the legal processing of juveniles in adult criminal courts and sentencing of juveniles to adult prisons" (p. 11). The conceptualization by Schwartz et al. (1993) was used in my study since it focused exclusively on juvenile delinquency instead of punitive attitudes for all criminal offenders. The conceptualization offered by Schwartz et al. (1993) needed clarification to mention sentencing of juveniles as adults. The conceptualization used in my study was the legal processing of juveniles in adult criminal courts, sentencing juveniles as adults, and sentencing of juveniles to adult prisons. I operationalized punitive attitudes for juvenile offenders through the use of survey questions originally used by Schwartz et al. (1996) in their assessment of attitudes by the general public about juvenile delinquency and the juvenile justice system and through the use of original questions constructed for this survey. The following questions were used to operationalize punitive attitudes based on the work by Schwartz et al. (1996):

- A juvenile accused of a crime should receive the same due process rights as an adult.
- The main purpose of the juvenile court system should be to treat and rehabilitate young offenders.
- The main purpose of the juvenile court system should be to punish young offenders.
- A juvenile charged with a **serious property crime** should be tried as an adult.
- A juvenile charged with **selling illegal drugs** should be tried as an adult.

- A juvenile charged with a **serious violent crime** should be tried as an adult.
- A juvenile convicted of a **serious property crime** should serve their sentence in an adult prison.
- A juvenile convicted of **selling illegal drugs** should serve their sentence in an adult prison.
- A juvenile convicted of a **serious violent crime** should serve their sentence in an adult prison.

For all of the above questions, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement for each statement with "Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, or Strongly Disagree". For the question of what the main purpose of the juvenile court system should be, respondents were asked to respond with either "treat and rehabilitate, punish, or both."

Data Analysis

The current study utilized four different methods of data analysis: bivariate analysis, analysis of variance (ANOVA), linear regression, and ordinal logistical regression. This section will describe the processes that were used to analyze the data that was collected for the current study.

The first step in the data analysis process was the construction of a codebook used to guide the process of inputting that data that is collected into SPSS. Babbie (2004) explained the coding process "is the conversion of data items into numerical codes. These codes represent attributes composing variables, which in turn, are assigned locations within a data file. A codebook is a document that describes the locations of variables and lists the assignments of codes to the attributes composing these variables" (p. 452).

SPSS was used to organize and analyze the data collected from my survey. The first step that was completed, before the data collected from my survey can be analyzed, was to ensure that the data did not contain any possible errors made when inputting the data into SPSS. As Pallant (2007) pointed out, this is an important step in the process of data analysis in order to make sure there are no outliers present with the data and to ensure the number of missing cases is kept as minimal as possible.

The second step in the data analysis according to Pallant (2007) was to move onto the descriptive stage of data analysis. There are two reasons why it is important to provide the descriptive statistics that will be incorporated into the data analysis section of my thesis. The first reason is the assumptions, for the statistical analyses I am performing for my study, need to be tested in order to ensure they are not being violated. In order to test to ensure the assumptions are not being violated, we need to obtain the descriptive statistics for my sample. The second reason why descriptive statistics are included within the data analysis section is it is useful to have this information collected since we are dealing with human subjects.

The output for the descriptive statistics will vary depending upon whether it is a categorical variable or a continuous variable. A frequency table will provide the descriptive statistics for a categorical variable. Examples of categorical variables include sex, religious background, geographic location, political ideology, etc. An example of a continuous variable would include age. Descriptive statistics will provide a summary for these continuous variables. The summary will include the mean, median, and standard deviation for each of the continuous variable examined in my study.

The third step in the process of data analysis was analyzing data for bivariate relationships. Several different statistical methods were used to test for possible relationships between independent variables and the dependent variables of punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The first statistical test used was bivariate analyses. Babbie (2005) describes bivariate analyses as "the analysis of two variables simultaneously, for the purpose of determining the empirical relationship between them…the computation of a simple correlation coefficient is an example of bivariate analyses (p. 429). Babbie (2005) described bivariate correlations can run from -1.0-+1.0 with numbers that are closer to -1.0 and +1.0 being desirable.

The fourth step in the process of data analysis was to analyze the data collected in the current study through analysis of variance (ANOVA). Pallant (2013:258) stated this form of statistical modeling is used when we are interested in knowing if there is a difference when comparing the mean scores between two groups or more. The reason why analysis of variance is important is that it allows us to compare "the variance (variability in scores) between the different groups (believed to be due to the independent

variable) with the variability within each of the groups (believed to be due to chance)" (p. 258).

The third form of statistical testing used to analyze the data in the current study was the use of linear regression. The fourth and final form of statistical analysis used in the current study was the use of ordinal logistical regression. Ordinal logistical regression was used in order to determine whether any of the independent variables predicted the dependent variable(s) of punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) described logistic regression as a statistical technique used to predict "group membership from a set of variables…(and) when independent variables are a mix of continuous and discrete and/or poorly distributed" (p. 23). For this study, logistic regression will be used to predict whether or not a survey respondent has punitive attitudes based upon political ideology, a fear of victimization, and other demographic variables. "Logistic regression allows one to evaluate the odds (or probability) of membership in one of the groups based on the combination of values of the predictor variables" (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007:25). Ordinal logistic regression is a statistical technique that is used in order to predict a dependent variable which is measured at the ordinal level when you use one or more independent variables. Ordinal logistic regression was used to predict punitiveness among college students

Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) argued there are relatively few theoretical issues with the use of logistic regression as an analytical strategy. They caution using logistic regression to assert causation. For this study, the results will not support a claim that any of the dependent variables (political ideology, fear of victimization, demographic variables) cause punitive attitudes about the juvenile justice system. They also point out "the importance of selecting predictors on the basis of a well-justified, theoretical model cannot be overemphasized…it is tempting (and often common in the research community) to amass a large number of predictors and then, on the basis of a single data set, eliminate those that are not statistically significant" (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007:441).

Ethical Issues

One of the potential ethical issues that was addressed was over the question of whether or not the student has been victimized within the past twelve months prior to

receiving the survey. It is possible the student may have been the victim of a violent crime and may be traumatized as the result of being victimized. It may be psychologically stressful for the student to be asked such a question. To counter these concerns, students were not asked any questions about prior victimization that would be considered a violent felony. On the prior survey used to provide questions of prior victimization, there was a question that asked students if they were the victim of a sexual assault. This question was not used in my survey to minimize any psychological stress that could come about from having been victimized. Students were advised of their right to opt out from completing the survey and were provided with resources from the counseling center in case they found the survey to be psychologically stressful on them.

An additional area of risk associated with the survey was to ensure that all research participants received anonymity throughout the course of the research project and after the completion of my research project. In the cover letter each student received in addition to the survey, it was made very clear that respondents would not be asked any information that could be used to identify them. Furthermore, students were informed to not include any information on their survey that could be used to identify them. If a subject included such information, the survey was destroyed and was not included in the statistical analysis of the data.

The final ethical issue was to ensure all subjects that their participation was voluntary and they were free to not participate in the study without any consequences against them. Furthermore, each subject was advised of their right to withdraw their voluntary participation at any given time during the process without any consequences to them. When a student completed and returned their survey, this was used to imply that they had given their informed consent to participate in the study. The IRB at MSU-Mankato was especially concerned that students from the researcher's classes were included in the sampling frame and asked that the researcher not be present at the time that the survey was completed. This was adhered to in order to ensure that students did not feel pressured, coerced to participate in the study and that their study was totally voluntary. (*See Appendix A: Informed Consent*)

CHAPTER IV

Analysis

In this chapter, I will present the findings and results from the current study. The first section of this chapter will be devoted to frequencies and descriptive statistics provided for the variables included in my study. The second section of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion of the scale indexes that were used to measure conservative political ideology, liberal political ideology, fear of victimization, and punitiveness. The third section of this chapter will be devoted to the bivariate correlations between the independent and dependent variables used in the current study. The fourth section of this chapter will be devoted to analysis of variance (ANOVA). The fifth section of this chapter will be devoted to linear regression. The sixth and final section of this chapter will be devoted to ordinal logistical regression.

The findings and results for the current study are based on a final sample size of 111 students who were enrolled in sociology classes at Lake Superior College in Duluth, MN. Surveys were distributed to students in seven face-to-face sociology classes based on the sampling discussed previously. There were a few issues that appeared when sampling that I will now discuss. The first issue was my intention for the survey to be distributed to students in ALL sociology classes at Lake Superior College which included face-to-face and online classes, however the final result from distributing the survey to students in online sociology classes produced only sixteen usable surveys. Since the response rate was very low for on-line sociology classes, online sociology classes were not included in the final sample, and the sixteen usable surveys were not used for inclusion within the final data analysis. I will discuss the implications of excluding online courses in the conclusion section. In addition to a lack of a significant number of usable surveys from online classes, the survey was not distributed to students who were enrolled in SOC 1116 Criminal Justice & Society because the survey was administered after the class completed for the semester. Students in this class were not included in the final sample used for this study. The final sample only included students who were in the following sociology classes at Lake Superior College during the 2015 spring semester:

Introduction to Sociology (SOC 1111) Sections 01, 02, 03, 04, and 05

Juvenile Delinquency (SOC 1130) Section 01

A total of 130 students were present at the time that the survey was distributed. A total of 18 students withdrew their participation from the study. One of the most prevalent reasons for withdrawing participation was students who were under the age of 18 at the time that the survey was distributed. Students who were under the age of 18 were informed that they could not participate in the study and were asked to write "withdraw" on their survey when completed surveys were collected. Students who completed the survey in another course were asked to not complete the survey a second time, which would have skewed the final results. Some students also chose to withdraw their participation for other reasons not stated above and did not disclose why they chose to withdraw their participation from the current study. One respondent also completed the survey indicating an age less than 18 at the time of the study. The respondent's survey was excluded from the final analysis. All surveys which were withdrawn, or excluded, were not included in the final sample or the final data analysis. The overall response rate for students in face-to-face sociology classes was 85.4%.

Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics

In this section, I will discuss the demographic variables in relation to population at Lake Superior College. In general, the study sample is similar to the overall population of the college with certain exceptions noted below. For the details of the demographic and other variables, see Appendix C: Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics.

Sex was measured by students answering the question whether they were male, female, or other. 48.6% of students responded by saying male and 50.5% of students responded by answering female. 9% of students did not respond to this question. Statistics provided by Lake Superior College's Office of Accreditation and Institutional Research shows that enrollment at Lake Superior College for the fall semester of 2013, the most recent information provided by Lake Superior College's Institutional Research Department, shows that female students comprise 56% of Lake Superior College's total student population and male students comprise 41% of Lake Superior College's total student population (Lake Superior College Fact Book, 2014). When comparing frequencies for my study with the statistics provided by Lake Superior College's Institutional Research; it appears male students were slightly overrepresented in my sample and female students were underrepresented in my sample.

For my study age was examined as a continuous variable and students were asked to fill in the blank for their age. The median age for students completing this survey were 23 and 90.6% of students who completed the survey were under the age of 30 at the time that they completed the survey. Lake Superior College's Office of Accreditation and Institutional Research shows that students who are under the age of 18 comprise 13% of Lake Superior College's total student enrollment, 18-20 comprise 27% of Lake Superior College's total student enrollment, 21-24 comprise 22% of Lake Superior College's total student enrollment, and 25+ comprise 37% of Lake Superior College's total student enrollment (Lake Superior College Fact Book, 2014). From the data that was collected for the current study; students between the ages of 18-20 comprised 53.1% of responses, students between the ages of 21-24 comprised 19.8% of responses, and 25 and over comprised 27.1% of responses. When comparing the frequencies for the current study with the statistics provided by Lake Superior College's Institutional Research it appears that my survey significantly overrepresented students between the ages of 18-20 and underrepresented students who were 25+ as well.

When asked to self-identify their race, 86.5% of students self identified as being white. 5.4% of students self identified themselves as African-American. 1.8% of students self identified themselves as Hispanic. 2.7% of students self identified themselves as Asian. 1.8% of students self identified themselves as Native-American. 1.8% of students chose to not answer this question. By far most students who chose to participate in my study are white. Statistics provided by Lake Superior College's Office of Accreditation and Institutional Research shows that enrollment at Lake Superior College for the fall semester of 2013, the most recent information provided by Lake Superior College's Institutional Research Department, shows that 83% of students self-identified their race/ethnicity as Caucasian, 3% as African American, 2% as Hispanic, 2% as Native American, 1% as Asian, and 4% Other (Lake Superior College Fact Book, 2014). When comparing the frequencies for my study with the statistics provided by Lake Superior College's Institutional Research it appears that my survey slightly overrepresented Caucasians, African Americans and Asians. The frequencies for Hispanics and Native Americans are very close to the actual percentage of the students at Lake Superior College who self-identified these two races/ethnicities.

Students were asked to answer the question of their current academic level while currently attending Lake Superior College. In response to this question, 1.8% of students described their academic level as PSEO (Post Secondary Enrollment Option), 45.9% of students described their academic level as freshman, 42.3% of students described their academic level as sophomore, 5.4% of students described their academic level as Junior, 2.7% of students described their academic level as Senior, and 1.8% of students did not answer this question. For a two-year community college, it would be expected that most students would describe themselves as being either a freshman or sophomore based on the number of credits that they have completed while attending Lake Superior College.

Statistics provided by Lake Superior College's Office of Accreditation and Institutional Research includes enrollment statistics at Lake Superior College for the fall semester of 2013, the most recent information provided by Lake Superior College's Institutional Research Department. Statistics provided by Lake Superior College's Institutional Research shows that 64% of students at Lake Superior College are freshman and 36% of students at Lake Superior College are sophomores (Lake Superior College Fact Book, 2014). The survey question in this study, based on Falco's (2008) operationalization, does not breakdown the variable of Academic Level simply into Freshman or Sophomore which is how Lake Superior College's Institutional Research reports this information. While the operationalization differs, it appears my sample underrepresented freshman and overrepresented sophomores.

Bivariate Relationships

Demographic Variables

The first set of tests for bivariate correlations examined the possible relationship between demographic variables and punitive attitudes. Bivariate correlations can run from -1.0-+1.0 with numbers that are closer to -1.0 and +1.0 being desirable. In this examination, three correlation matrices were created. The first correlation matrix looks at correlations between the independent variables of political scale in a liberal direction, sex, age, traditional or non-traditional student, academic level, race, urban or rural, religious commitment, and television hours and the dependent variable of punitiveness scale.

The first correlation matrix examines the correlations between independent demographic variables and the dependent variable of the punitiveness scale that was created. Upon examination of the correlation coefficients, it was discovered that only one independent variable, when examining demographic variables, is significantly correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale at the 0.01 level. A negative correlation was found between the independent variable of political scale in a liberal direction and the punitiveness scale (r=-.345**). This result suggests that students who strongly align with a liberal political perspective tend to hold less punitive views.

Further examination of the correlation coefficients shows two independent variables, when examining demographic variables, is significantly correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale at the 0.05 level. A positive correlation was found between the independent variable of traditional/non-traditional student and the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=.217*). This result suggests that whether or not a student is a traditional student or a non-traditional student is positively associated with punitive views. The variable of traditional or non-traditional student was divided into two groups with one group being students who reported their age being between 18-23 and the second group with students who reported their age as 24 or greater.

Table 1a: Bivariate Correlation Matrix (Demographic Variables)

	Punitiveness Scale	Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	Sex	Age	Traditional and Non-Traditional	Academic Level	Race (White-Non White)	Urban-Rural	Religious Commitment	Television Hours
Punitiveness Scale	1	-.345**	.070	.095	.217*	.177	-.070	.026	-.120	.204*
Political Scale (Liberal Direction)		1	-.177	-.259**	-.254**	-.166	-.032	-.005	.113	-.162
Sex			1	.076	.092	.045	-.095	.098	.102	.163
Age				1	.785**	.234*	.299**	-.031	.125	.039
Traditional and Non-Traditional					1	.265**	.292**	.023	.036	-.017
Academic Level						1	.105	.082	-.029	-.084
Race (White-Non White)							1	.265**	.083	-.249**
Urban-Rural								1	-.120	-.019
Religious Commitment									1	.113
Television Hours										1

NOTE:** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The second positive correlation was found between the independent variable of television hours watched and the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=.207*). To prevent response bias from emerging, the survey included a dummy variable of television hours to diversify possible independent variables for the respondents. If all the questions focused on the same issue, respondents may notice a pattern and answer questions based on what they expect the researchers desire to find. Television hours were divided into two groups: those that watched less than 20 hours of TV and those that watched 20 or more hours a week. The literature reviewed for this study did not examine television hours in relation to punitive attitudes toward juveniles. This result suggests that the amount of television that a student watches in a week is positively associated with punitive views. The first bivariate correlation matrix shows no significant associations between the

demographic variables of: sex, age, academic level, urban/rural, and religious commitment with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale. It should be pointed out that the association between academic level and the dependent variable of punitiveness scale neared statistical significance (r=.177); however, it did not reach the threshold required for statistical significance at the 0.05 level.

The second bivariate correlation matrix examines the independent variables of political scale in a liberal direction, victimization scale as a sum, victimization scale as a dichotomous variable, fear of victimization as a scale, fear of victimization of property crimes as a scale, fear of victimization of violent crimes as a scale, sex, race (coded as white or non-white), and religious commitment. As noted above, there was a significant negative correlation with the independent variable of political scale in a liberal direction and the dependent variable of punitiveness scale. Examination of the correlation coefficients shows one independent variable being significantly associated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale at the 0.05 level. The independent variable of victimization as a dichotomous variable is positively correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=.229*).

Table 1b: Bivariate Correlation Matrix (Political, Victimization, Fear of Victimization, and Selected Demographic Variables)

	Punitiveness Scale	Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	Victimization Scale (Summed)	Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	Fear Scale	Fear Scale (Property Crimes)	Fear Scale (Violent Crimes)	Sex	Race (White-Non White)	Religious Commitment
Punitiveness Scale	1	-.345**	.151	.229*	.037	.070	.021	.070	-.070	.120
Political Scale (Liberal Direction)		1	-.178	-.234*	-.219*	-.148	-.230*	-.177	-.032	.113
Victimization Scale (Summed)			1	.603**	.161	.178	.129	.158	.224*	-.122
Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)				1	.270**	.312**	.219*	.167	.122	-.141
Fear Scale					1	.907**	.973**	.422**	.081	.201*
Fear Scale (Property Crimes)						1	.786**	.357**	-.021	.211*
Fear Scale (Violent Crimes)							1	.430**	.100	.174
Sex								1	-.095	.102
Race (White-Non White)									1	.083
Religious Commitment										1

NOTE:** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Victimization was coded in this matrix in two different scales. The first scale examined victimization as a total sum where all of the offenses that a student reported being the victim of were added together for a total sum. The second scale examined victimization as a dichotomous variable where a student was coded as either being a victim of various listed offenses; or, they were not the victim of various listed offenses. When examining victimization as a sum, no significant associations existed. No other significant associations were discovered between the independent variables of fear of victimization as a scale, fear of victimization of property crimes as a scale, fear of victimization of violent crimes as a scale, sex, race (coded as white or non-white), and religious commitment with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale.

The third and final bivariate correlation matrix examines the independent variables of political scale in a liberal direction, liberal scale incorporating only the variables of gay rights, minimum wage, and taxes, liberal scale incorporating only the

variables of minimum wage and taxes, conservative scale incorporating only the variables of abortion and gay rights, liberal, conservative, moderate, and political party identification. The dependent variables examined in this bivariate correlation matrix are the variables of punitiveness scale, scale incorporating only the variables used for trying juveniles as adults, and the third punitive scale incorporating only the variables used for sentencing juveniles as adults. Discussion will begin with the significant associations between the independent variables and the dependent variable of punitiveness scale before proceeding with a discussion on the significant associations with the remaining two punitiveness scales.

Examination of the independent variables included in this third bivariate correlation matrix shows no independent variables significantly correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale at the 0.05 level; however, examination shows several highly significant positive correlations at the 0.01 level. The first significant positive correlation exists between the independent variable of conservative scale incorporating only abortion and gay rights is positively correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=.288**).

Table 1c: Bivariate Correlation Matrix (Political Ideology)

	Punitiveness Scale	Scale Juveniles Tried as Adults	Scale Juveniles Sentenced as Adults	Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	Liberal Scale (Gay Rights, Min. Wage, Taxes)	Liberal Scale (Min. Wage. Taxes)	Conservative Scale (Abortion and Gay Rights)	Liberal	Conservative	Moderate	Political Party Id
Punitiveness Scale	1	.855**	.877**	-.345**	-.290**	-.304**	.288**	-.310**	.273**	.160	-.341**
Scale Juveniles Tried as Adults		1	.649**	-.331**	-.322**	-.334**	.258**	-.353**	.185	.052	-.340**
Scale Juveniles Sentenced as Adults			1	-.270**	-.199*	-.213*	.251**	-.203	.308**	.260**	-.289*
Political Scale (Liberal Direction)				1	.849**	.939**	-.692**	.447**	-.345**	.119	.533**
Liberal Scale (Gay Rights, Min. Wage, and Taxes)					1	.928**	-.428**	.487**	-.297**	.139	.493**
Liberal Scale (Min. Wage and Taxes)						1	-.677**	.464**	-.334**	.135	.536**
Conservative Scale (Abortion and Gay Rights)							1	-.312**	.377**	-.107	-.398**
Liberal								1	-.416**	.238*	.530**
Conservative									1	.206*	-.483**
Moderate										1	.034
Political Party Identification											1

NOTE:**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The second significant positive correlation exists between the independent variable of self-identification as a conservative is positively correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=.273**). These correlations show that there is a significant positive relationship between students believing in a conservative political ideology and support for punitive measures of trying and sentencing juveniles as adults.

As previously discussed, there was a highly significant negative correlation with the independent variable of political scale in a liberal direction. The independent variable

of liberal scale incorporating only gay rights, minimum wage, and taxes is negatively correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=-.290**) and is highly significant. The independent variable of liberal scale incorporating only minimum wage and taxes is negatively correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=-.304**) and is highly significant. The independent variable of self-identification as a liberal is negatively correlated with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=-.310**) and is highly significant. The final negative correlation exists between the independent variable of political party identification and the dependent variable of punitiveness scale (r=-.341**) and is highly significant. These significant correlations show that students who agree with a liberal political ideology are less likely to support punitive measures in trying and sentencing juveniles as adults. Finally, this examination shows that political party identification has a negative influence on support for the punitive measures of trying and sentencing juveniles as adults. Examination of the third bivariate correlation matrix shows a lack of a significant correlation between the independent variable of self-identification as a moderate with the dependent variable of punitiveness scale.

The second set of relationships that were examined from the third bivariate correlation matrix examines the impact of political variables with the dependent variable of the second punitiveness scale. The second punitiveness scale examines the three variables used for trying juveniles as adults. Similar to the punitiveness scale used for all punitive variables; no significant correlations exist between the independent variables and the dependent variable at the 0.05 level; however, there are highly significant positive correlations that exist at the 0.01 level. The only positive correlation discovered is between the independent variable of conservative scale and the dependent variable of punitive scale trying juveniles as adults (r=.258**) and is highly significant. Interestingly, there is no significant correlation between self-identification as a conservative with the dependent variable of punitive scale of trying juveniles as adults; although, it neared statistical significance (r=.185). These results show that when looking at trying juveniles for adults, students who identify with a conservative political ideology are more likely to support punitive measures; yet, self-identification as a conservative is not significantly associated with support for these punitive measures.

Examination of the third bivariate correlation matrix shows several highly significant negative correlations with the scale created for trying juveniles as adults. The first negative correlation exists between the political scale in a liberal direction and the dependent variable of the scale for trying juveniles as adults (r=-.331**). The second negative correlation is between the liberal political scale incorporating the variables for gay rights, minimum wage, and taxes with the dependent variable of the scale for trying juveniles as adults (r=-.322**). The third negative correlation exists between the liberal political scale incorporating the variables for minimum wage and taxes with the dependent variable of the scale for trying juveniles as adults (r=-.334**) The fourth negative correlation exists between the independent variable of self-identification as a liberal and the dependent variable of the scale for trying juveniles as adults (r=-.353**). The fifth and final negative correlation exists between the independent variable of political party identification and the dependent variable of the scale for trying juveniles as adults (r=-.340**). Similar to the dependent variable of punitiveness scale incorporating all punitive variables used in this study; these correlations show that students who identify with and self-agree with a liberal political ideology tend to show less support for punitive measures of trying and sentencing juveniles as adults. Also, these correlations show that political party identification is negatively associated with support for punitive measures of trying and sentencing juveniles as adults. No significant correlations existed with the independent variable of self-identification as a moderate and the dependent variable of the scale constructed for juveniles trying as adults.

The third and final set of relationships that were examined from the third bivariate correlation matrix examines the impact of political variables with the dependent variable of the third punitiveness scale used in this study. The third punitiveness scale examines the three variables used for sentencing juveniles as adults. The examination of the data shows three highly significant positive correlations at the 0.01 level. The first highly significant correlation exists between the conservative scale constructed using the variables of abortion and gay rights and the punitive scale constructed using the variables of sentencing juveniles as adults (r=.251**) The second highly significant correlation exists between the independent variable of self-identification as a conservative and the punitive scale constructed using the variables of sentencing juveniles as adults

(r=.308**). The third and final significant correlation exists between the independent variable of self-identification as a moderate and the punitive scale constructed using the variables of sentencing juveniles as adults (r=.260**).These significant correlations show that students who identify with and self agree with, a conservative political ideology tend to show more support for the punitive measures of sentencing juveniles as adults. The results also show that students who self-identify with being a moderate are more likely to show support for the punitive measures of sentencing juveniles as adults.

There are a few observations from this bivariate correlation matrix that are particularly interesting and the first of these is with the self-identification variable of conservative. Self-identification as a conservative did not significantly correlate with the scale constructed for trying juveniles as adults; however, it did reach statistical significance, and highly statistically significant, with the scale constructed for sentencing juveniles as adults. One would expect to see that if this relationship was statistically significant with sentencing juveniles as adults, that it should also have been statistically significant with trying juveniles as adults. I would have expected this as sentencing juveniles as adults shows a higher level of punitiveness as opposed to trying juveniles in the adult system; but, not subjecting juveniles to being sentenced to adult prisons. Also of interest is that this is the first significant correlation which exists between the self-identification variable of moderate with any of the punitive scales constructed for this study. Once again, it is interesting that this is the first significant correlation which exists with the self-identification variable of moderate and the punitive scales constructed for analyzing the data collected in this study. Much like self-identification as a conservative, it would have been expected that if students who self-agree as a moderate and show support for punitive measures of sentencing juveniles as adults, it would have been expected that the same relationship would have existed between self-identification as a moderate and the scale used for trying juveniles as adults. Why students would show more support for sentencing juveniles to adult prisons as opposed to trying juveniles as adults is a question that should be further explored. One possible explanation is that college students do not have a good, thorough understanding of the juvenile justice system.

Two highly significant negative correlations exist between the political scale in a liberal direction and the dependent variable of the punitive scale constructed for sentencing juveniles as adults (r=-.270**) The second and final highly significant correlation is with the independent variable of political party identification and the punitive scale constructed for sentencing juveniles as adults (r=-.289*) Similar to the previous discussions with the relationship between the political scale in a liberal direction and the punitive scales, students who agree with a liberal political ideology are less likely to support punitive measures for sentencing juveniles as adults. Similar to the previous discussions with the relationship between political party identification and the punitive scale, political party identification is negatively correlated with support for punitive measures of sentencing juveniles as adults.

Finally, there are four significant negative correlations which exist with the scale constructed for sentencing juveniles to adult prisons at the 0.05 level. The first significant negative correlation is with the liberal political scale constructed consisting of the variables for gay rights, minimum wage, and taxes and the punitive scale constructed for sentencing juveniles as adults (r=-.199*). The second significant negative correlation is with the liberal political scale constructed consisting of the variables of minimum wage and taxes and the punitive scale constructed for sentencing juveniles as adults(r=-.213*). The third and final significant negative correlation is with the self-identification variable of liberal and the punitive scale constructed for sentencing juveniles as adults (r=-.203*). While this final round of correlations continues to show that students who identify with a liberal political ideology show less support for sentencing juveniles as adults, that level of opposition is not as strong as it is with the two previous punitive scales. This is similar to the findings when it came to the students who identify with and self-agree with a conservative political ideology and is also true for students who self-agree as a moderate for the punitive scale of sentencing juveniles as adults.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

When running the statistics with the use of analysis of variance in SPSS, Pallant (2013) states researchers need to pay close attention to the column that is marked “Sig.” Significance values of less than .05 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference “somewhere among the mean scores on your dependent variable for the three

groups". (2013, 262) The significance value alone though does not tell us which group is different from the other groups and additional testing has to be conducted.

Demographic Variables

For the dependent variable of punitive attitudes; I used the three scales that were described previously, in the operationalization and measurement of the dependent variable of punitiveness, against the independent variables that were also described previously, in the section on operationalization and measurement of independent variables. I will begin this section of the data analysis with demographic variables using analysis of variance against the dependent variable of punitive attitudes as measured through the use of three different punitive scales.

Table 4a: ANOVA Report For Sex

Sex Dichotomous		Punitiveness Scale	Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult	Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult
Male	Mean	28.0385	7.6923	9.6604
	N	52	52	53
	Std. Deviation	5.99006	2.89380	2.93483
Female	Mean	28.9818	8.0364	9.9643
	N	55	55	56
	Std. Deviation	7.52647	3.81985	3.99984
Total	Mean	28.5234	7.8692	9.8165
	N	107	107	109
	Std. Deviation	6.80780	3.39001	3.50968

Table 4b: ANOVA Table For Sex

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Sex Dichotomous	Between Groups	(Combined)	23.787	1	23.787	.511	.476
	Within Groups		4888.905	105	46.561		
	Total		4912.692	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Sex Dichotomous	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.164	1	3.164	.273	.602
	Within Groups		1215.004	105	11.571		
	Total		1218.168	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Sex Dichotomous	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.515	1	2.515	.203	.653
	Within Groups		1327.815	107	12.409		
	Total		1330.330	108			

The first independent demographic variable analyzed was sex which was classified as either male, female, or other. All three Sig values were found to not be statistically significant. The first sig value was sex and punitiveness scale with a Sig value of a.476. The second sig value was sex and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig value of .602. The third sig value was sex and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig value of .653. Since all three Sig values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of sex and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4c: ANOVA Table For Age

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	1007.279	19	53.015	1.234	.252
	Within Groups		3566.780	83	42.973		
	Total		4574.058	102			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	193.330	19	10.175	.882	.605
	Within Groups		957.524	83	11.536		
	Total		1150.854	102			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	277.368	19	14.598	1.232	.252
	Within Groups		1007.166	85	11.849		
	Total		1284.533	104			

The second independent demographic variable analyzed was age where respondents were asked to indicate their age. All three Sig values were found to not be statistically significant. The first sig value was age and punitiveness scale with a Sig value of .252. The second Sig value was age and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig value of .605. The third Sig value was age and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig value of .252. Since all three Sig values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of age and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4d: ANOVA Table For Race and Ethnicity

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Race Ethnicity	Between Groups	(Combined)	73.657	4	18.414	.387	.818
	Within Groups		4808.239	101	47.606		
	Total		4881.896	105			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Race Ethnicity	Between Groups	(Combined)	59.345	4	14.836	1.297	.276
	Within Groups		1155.296	101	11.439		
	Total		1214.642	105			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Race Ethnicity	Between Groups	(Combined)	7.693	4	1.923	.151	.962
	Within Groups		1307.937	103	12.698		
	Total		1315.630	107			

The third independent demographic variable analyzed was race/ethnicity where respondents were asked to indicate their race/ethnicity from the choices that were given; or, were allowed to write in their race/ethnicity as other if their race/ethnicity was not represented with the choices given. Again, all three Sig values were found to not be statistically significant. The first sig value was race/ethnicity and punitiveness scale with a Sig value of .818. The second Sig value was race/ethnicity and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig value of .276. The third Sig value was race/ethnicity and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig value of .962. Since all three Sig values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of age and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4e: ANOVA Table For Academic Level

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Academic Level	Between Groups	(Combined)	259.415	4	64.854	1.436	.228
	Within Groups		4561.727	101	45.166		
	Total		4821.142	105			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Academic Level	Between Groups	(Combined)	39.220	4	9.805	.846	.499
	Within Groups		1170.639	101	11.590		
	Total		1209.858	105			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Academic Level	Between Groups	(Combined)	85.539	4	21.385	1.791	.136
	Within Groups		1230.091	103	11.943		
	Total		1315.630	107			

The fourth independent demographic variable analyzed was academic level where students were asked to indicate their academic level based on the number of credits that they had completed at the time that the survey was distributed. Again, all three Sig Values were found to not be statistically significant. The first sig value was academic level and punitiveness scale with a Sig Value of .228. The second Sig value was academic level and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .499. The third Sig Value was academic level and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .136. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of academic level and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4f: ANOVA Table For International Student

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * International Student	Between Groups	(Combined)	42.956	1	42.956	.926	.338
	Within Groups		4869.736	105	46.378		
	Total		4912.692	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * International Student	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.527	1	3.527	.305	.582
	Within Groups		1214.642	105	11.568		
	Total		1218.168	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * International Student	Between Groups	(Combined)	14.701	1	14.701	1.196	.277
	Within Groups		1315.630	107	12.296		
	Total		1330.330	108			

The fifth independent demographic variable analyzed was whether or not a student was an international student or not. Again, all three Sig Values were found to not be statistically significant. The first Sig Value was international student and punitiveness scale with a Sig Value of .338. The second Sig Value was international student or not and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .582. The third Sig Value was international student or not and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .277. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of international student status and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4g: ANOVA Table For Geographic Region

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Geographic Region	Between Groups	(Combined)	190.503	2	95.252	2.116	.126
	Within Groups		4456.957	99	45.020		
	Total		4647.461	101			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Geographic Region	Between Groups	(Combined)	23.121	2	11.560	1.001	.371
	Within Groups		1142.879	99	11.544		
	Total		1166.000	101			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Geographic Region	Between Groups	(Combined)	76.012	2	38.006	3.315	.040
	Within Groups		1157.834	101	11.464		
	Total		1233.846	103			

Table 4h: Measures of Association For Geographic Region

	Eta	Eta Squared
Punitiveness Scale * Geographic Region	.202	.041
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Geographic Region	.141	.020
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Geographic Region	.248	.062

The sixth independent variable analyzed was the geographic region that a student was primarily raised with the option of answering rural, suburban, or urban. This is the first independent variable where a statistically significant difference was found with a Sig value of .05 or less. The first Sig Value was geographic region and punitiveness scale with a Sig Value of .126. The second Sig Value was geographic region and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .371. The third and final Sig Value was geographic region and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .040. Since this Sig Value is less than .05 we can assume that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of variance for this particular relationship. According to Pallant (2013) this indicates to us that "there is a statistically significant result somewhere among the groups". (2013, 263) This is one of the few variables when it comes to demographic variables being significantly related

to punitiveness. Table 4h shows the amount of variance in punitiveness that is explained by geographic region for the scale that juveniles should be sentenced to an adult prison. 6.2% of the variance in punitiveness is explained by geographic region when examining the punitive scale created for sentencing juveniles to adult prisons and this is just barely a moderate effect according to Pallant (2013). Since no significant relationships existed between punitiveness and the geographic region in the two scales; it is not necessary to explain the amount of variation that is explained by geographic region for those first two scales as there is not a significant relationship.

Table 4i: ANOVA Table For Religious Commitment

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Religious Commitment	Between (Combined) Groups	222.137	6	37.023	.789	.580
	Within Groups	4690.554	100	46.906		
	Total	4912.692	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Religious Commitment	Between (Combined) Groups	70.696	6	11.783	1.027	.412
	Within Groups	1147.472	100	11.475		
	Total	1218.168	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Religious Commitment	Between (Combined) Groups	68.222	6	11.370	.919	.485
	Within Groups	1262.108	102	12.374		
	Total	1330.330	108			

The seventh independent variable analyzed was the level of commitment that respondents had to their religious beliefs. The first Sig Value was level of commitment to one's religious beliefs and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .580. The second Sig Value was level of commitment to one's religious beliefs and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .412. The third Sig Value was level of commitment to one's religious beliefs and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .485. Since all three Sig Values were

greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of commitment to one's religious beliefs and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4j: ANOVA Table For Religious Affiliation

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Religious Affiliation	Between Groups	(Combined)	742.911	11	67.537	1.509	.141
	Within Groups		4206.447	94	44.749		
	Total		4949.358	105			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Religious Affiliation	Between Groups	(Combined)	179.009	11	16.274	1.465	.158
	Within Groups		1044.425	94	11.111		
	Total		1223.434	105			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Religious Affiliation	Between Groups	(Combined)	202.308	11	18.392	1.582	.116
	Within Groups		1115.988	96	11.625		
	Total		1318.296	107			

The eighth independent variable analyzed was religious affiliation with students given the option of responding with the choices of: Catholic, Protestant (e.g. Methodist, Lutheran, Protestant, UCC), Conservative Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, None, and Other with the option of specifying which religious affiliation most closely describes their religious affiliation. The first Sig Value was religious affiliation and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .150. The second Sig Value was religious affiliation and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .146. The second Sig Value was religious affiliation and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .153. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of religious affiliation and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4k: ANOVA Table For Political Party Identification

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Democrat or Republican	Between Groups	(Combined)	387.668	1	387.668	8.926	.004
	Within Groups		2953.318	68	43.431		
	Total		3340.986	69			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Democrat or Republican	Between Groups	(Combined)	87.719	1	87.719	8.865	.004
	Within Groups		672.853	68	9.895		
	Total		760.571	69			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Democrat or Republican	Between Groups	(Combined)	69.113	1	69.113	6.384	.014
	Within Groups		757.873	70	10.827		
	Total		826.986	71			

Table 4l: Measures of Association For Political Party Identification

	Eta	Eta Squared
Punitiveness Scale * Democrat or Republican	.341	.116
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Democrat or Republican	.340	.115
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Democrat or Republican	.289	.084

The ninth independent variable analyzed was political party identification with students given the option of responding with the choices of: Democrat, Republican, Independent, or Other with the option of specifying which political party they most closely identified with. For this independent variable; all three Sig Values were found to be significant with values less than or equal to .05. The first Sig Value was political party identification and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .002. The second Sig Value was political party identification and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .004. The third Sig Value was political party identification and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig

Value of .039. Since all three Sig Values have values that are equal to or less than 0.05; according to Pallant (2013) this indicates to us that "there is a statistically significant result somewhere among the groups". (2013, 263) This is also the first independent variable which shows there is a statistically significant difference in the levels of variance between this variable and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes across all three scales that were used for the dependent variable. Table 4k shows the amount of variance in punitiveness that is explained by political party identification. For the punitiveness scale, 11.6% of the variance is explained by political party identification. For the tried as adult scale, 11.5% of the variance is explained by political party identification. For the sentenced to adult prison scale, 8.4% of the variance is explained by political party identification. According to Pallant (2013) the effect of political party identification as an explanation for punitiveness has a moderate level of effect.

Victimization and Fear of Victimization

The next set of variables that were analyzed for the ANOVA statistical model were the independent variables of victimization and fear of victimization with fear of victimization as the most important variable since the theoretical model used believed that punitiveness and punitive attitudes can be explained in part by one's fear of being victimized.

Table 4m: ANOVA Table For Victimization Scale (Summed)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Victimization Scale (Summed)	Between Groups	(Combined)	421.373	10	42.137	.846	.587
	Within Groups		4385.314	88	49.833		
	Total		4806.687	98			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Victimization Scale (Summed)	Between Groups	(Combined)	113.234	10	11.323	.913	.525
	Within Groups		1091.514	88	12.404		
	Total		1204.747	98			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Victimization Scale (Summed)	Between Groups	(Combined)	103.147	10	10.315	.797	.632
	Within Groups		1164.694	90	12.941		
	Total		1267.842	100			

The first variable that was analyzed was victimization with victimization as a total sum of all the number of times that a student had been victimized. The first Sig Value was victimization and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .587. The second Sig Value was victimization and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .525. The third Sig Value was victimization and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .632. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of victimization and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4n: ANOVA Table For Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	Between Groups	(Combined)	251.967	1	251.967	5.366	.023
	Within Groups		4554.720	97	46.956		
	Total		4806.687	98			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	Between Groups	(Combined)	69.340	1	69.340	5.924	.017
	Within Groups		1135.408	97	11.705		
	Total		1204.747	98			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	Between Groups	(Combined)	30.891	1	30.891	2.472	.119
	Within Groups		1236.950	99	12.494		
	Total		1267.842	100			

Table 4o: Measures of Association For Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)

	Eta	Eta Squared
Punitiveness Scale * Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	.229	.052
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	.240	.058
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	.156	.024

The second variable that was analyzed was victimization as a dichotomous variable with 0 for a student who had not been victimized and 1 for a student who had been victimized. The first Sig Value was victimization and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .023. The second Sig Value was victimization and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .017. The third Sig Value was victimization and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .119. Since the first two Sig Values show Sig Values that are less than or equal to .05 these are variables which indicate that "there is a statistically significant result somewhere among the groups". (2013, 263) Since the third Sig Value is greater than .05 we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the level of variation for victimization as a dichotomous variable and the punitive

scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison. Table 4o shows the amount of variance in punitiveness that is explained by victimization as a dichotomous variable. For the punitiveness scale, 5.2% of the variance is explained by victimization as a dichotomous variable. For the tried as adult scale, 5.8% of the variance is explained by victimization as a dichotomous variable. According to Pallant (2013) the effect of victimization as a dichotomous variable as an explanation for punitiveness has a small level of effect.

Table 4p: ANOVA Table For Fear Scale

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Fear Scale	Between Groups	(Combined)	1208.839	30	40.295	.809	.737
	Within Groups		3586.579	72	49.814		
	Total		4795.417	102			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Fear Scale	Between Groups	(Combined)	340.886	30	11.363	.955	.542
	Within Groups		856.764	72	11.900		
	Total		1197.650	102			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Fear Scale	Between Groups	(Combined)	313.917	30	10.464	.811	.735
	Within Groups		954.712	74	12.902		
	Total		1268.629	104			

The third variable analyzed was fear of victimization which was measured as a scale with mean values that ranged from 8-40 and includes all fear of victimization of both property and violent crimes together. The first Sig Value was fear of victimization and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .737. The second Sig Value was fear of victimization and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .542. The third Sig Value was fear of victimization and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .735. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically

significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of fear of victimization and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4q: ANOVA Table For Fear Scale (Property Crimes)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Fear Scale (Property Crimes)	Between Groups	(Combined)	300.255	12	25.021	.502	.909
	Within Groups		4538.966	91	49.879		
	Total		4839.221	103			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Fear Scale (Property Crimes)	Between Groups	(Combined)	107.189	12	8.932	.743	.706
	Within Groups		1094.196	91	12.024		
	Total		1201.385	103			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Fear Scale (Property Crimes)	Between Groups	(Combined)	49.518	12	4.127	.311	.986
	Within Groups		1234.066	93	13.270		
	Total		1283.585	105			

The fourth variable analyzed was fear of victimization looking only at fear of being the victim of property crimes with mean values that ranged from 3-15. The first Sig Value was fear of victimization of property crimes and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .909. The second Sig Value was fear of victimization of property crimes and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .706. The third Sig Value was fear of victimization of property crimes and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .986. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of fear of victimization of property crimes and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4r: ANOVA Table For Fear Scale (Violent Crimes)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Fear Scale (Violent Crimes)	Between Groups	(Combined)	1114.257	20	55.713	1.257	.231
	Within Groups		3812.472	86	44.331		
	Total		4926.729	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Fear Scale (Violent Crimes)	Between Groups	(Combined)	266.583	20	13.329	1.190	.283
	Within Groups		963.025	86	11.198		
	Total		1229.607	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Fear Scale (Violent Crimes)	Between Groups	(Combined)	340.144	20	17.007	1.533	.090
	Within Groups		976.205	88	11.093		
	Total		1316.349	108			

The fifth variable analyzed was fear of victimization looking only at fear of being the victim of violent crimes with mean values that ranged from 5-25. The first Sig Value was fear of victimization of violent crimes and punitive scale with a Sig value of .231. The second Sig Value was fear of victimization of violent crimes and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .283. The third Sig Value was fear of victimization of violent crimes and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .090. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of fear of victimization of violent crimes and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Political Ideology

The next set of variables that were analyzed for the ANOVA statistical model was the independent variables of political ideology. This is also an important set of variables since the theoretical model used believed that punitiveness and punitive attitudes can be explained in part by one's political ideology with conservative political ideology

positively correlated with punitiveness and punitive attitudes and liberal political ideology negatively correlated with punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Table 4s: ANOVA Table For Liberal

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Liberal	Between Groups	(Combined)	586.429	4	146.607	3.484	.010
	Within Groups		4292.131	102	42.080		
	Total		4878.561	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Liberal	Between Groups	(Combined)	194.771	4	48.693	4.853	.001
	Within Groups		1023.397	102	10.033		
	Total		1218.168	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Liberal	Between Groups	(Combined)	90.842	4	22.711	1.958	.106
	Within Groups		1206.094	104	11.597		
	Total		1296.936	108			

Table 4t: Measures of Association For Liberal

	Eta	Eta Squared
Punitiveness Scale * Liberal	.347	.120
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Liberal	.400	.160
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Liberal	.265	.070

The first variable analyzed was the self-identification variable of liberal with students being asked if they strongly agree, somewhat agree, neutral or no opinion, somewhat disagree, or strongly agree that they self-identify as being a liberal. The first Sig Value was liberal and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .010. The second Sig Value was liberal and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .001. The third Sig Value was liberal and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .106. Since the first two Sig Values show Sig Values that are less than or equal to .05 these are variables which indicate that

"there is a statistically significant result somewhere among the groups". (2013, 263) Since the third Sig Value is greater than .05 we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the level of variation for self-identification as a liberal and the punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison. Table 4t shows the amount of variance in punitiveness that is explained by self-identification as a liberal. For the punitiveness scale, 12.0% of the variance is explained by self-identification as a liberal. For the tried as adult scale, 16.0% of the variance is explained by self-identification as a liberal. According to Pallant (2013) the effect of self-identification as a liberal as an explanation for punitiveness for the punitiveness scale has a small level of effect. The effect of self-identification as a liberal as an explanation for punitiveness for the trying juveniles as adults scale has a large level of effect and is the first variable which has a large level of effect as an explanation. Since there was no significant relationship between the punitiveness scale for sentencing juveniles to adult prisons and self-identification as a liberal, it is not necessary to examine the level of explanation that self-identification as a liberal has on this punitive scale.

Table 4t: ANOVA Table For Conservative

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Conservative	Between Groups	(Combined)	564.589	4	141.147	3.337	.013
	Within Groups		4313.972	102	42.294		
	Total		4878.561	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Conservative	Between Groups	(Combined)	106.894	4	26.724	2.472	.049
	Within Groups		1102.526	102	10.809		
	Total		1209.421	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Conservative	Between Groups	(Combined)	202.561	4	50.640	4.729	.002
	Within Groups		1113.788	104	10.709		
	Total		1316.349	108			

Table 4u: Measures of Association For Conservative

	Eta	Eta Squared
Punitiveness Scale * Conservative	.340	.116
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Conservative	.297	.088
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Conservative	.392	.154

The second political ideology variable analyzed was the self-identification variable of conservative with students being asked if they strongly agree, somewhat agree, neutral or no opinion, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree that they self-identify as a conservative. The first Sig Value was conservative and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .013. The second Sig Value was conservative and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .049. The third Sig Value was conservative and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .002. Since all three Sig Values have values that are equal to or less than 0.05; according to Pallant (2013) this indicates to us that "there is a statistically significant result somewhere among the groups". (2013, 263) Table 4u shows the amount of variance in punitiveness that is explained by self-identification as a conservative. For the punitiveness scale, 11.6% of the variance is explained by self-identification as a conservative. For the tried as adult scale, 8.8% of the variance is explained by self-identification as a conservative. For the sentencing juveniles to adult prison scale, 15.4% of the variance is explained by self-identification as a conservative.

Table 4v: ANOVA Table For Political Scale (Liberal Direction)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	Between Groups	(Combined)	1278.692	21	60.890	1.438	.124
	Within Groups		3599.869	85	42.351		
	Total		4878.561	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	Between Groups	(Combined)	287.217	21	13.677	1.261	.226
	Within Groups		922.204	85	10.849		
	Total		1209.421	106			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	Between Groups	(Combined)	259.376	21	12.351	1.017	.453
	Within Groups		1056.972	87	12.149		
	Total		1316.349	108			

The third political ideology variable analyzed was political scale in a liberal direction which was analyzed as a mean. The first Sig Value was political scale in a liberal direction and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .124. The second Sig Value was political scale in a liberal direction and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .226. The third Sig Value was political scale in a liberal direction and punitive scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison with a Sig Value of .453. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of political ideology using a political scale in a liberal direction and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes. This result is particularly interesting as the bivariate relationships showed stronger correlations between the political scale in a liberal direction and punitiveness; however, ANOVA does not show results that are statistically significant when examining levels of variance for political ideology using a political scale in a liberal direction. It was expected that since there was a strong relationship between these two variables when examining bivariate correlations that statistically significant results would have existed when using ANOVA. What is also

interesting is that the bivariate correlations showed weaker relationships between the independent variables of self-agreement as a conservative and liberal with the dependent variable of punitiveness; however, ANOVA results showed statistically significant relationships with these independent variables.

Table 4w: ANOVA Table For Conservative Scale (Only Abortion and Same Sex Marriage)

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punitiveness Scale * Conservative Scale (Only Abortion and Same Sex Marriage)	Between Groups	(Combined)	655.020	8	81.878	1.879	.072
	Within Groups		4313.748	99	43.573		
	Total		4968.769	107			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult * Conservative Scale (Only Abortion and Same Sex Marriage)	Between Groups	(Combined)	150.489	8	18.811	1.720	.103
	Within Groups		1082.511	99	10.934		
	Total		1233.000	107			
Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult * Conservative Scale (Only Abortion and Same Sex Marriage)	Between Groups	(Combined)	146.374	8	18.297	1.560	.146
	Within Groups		1184.617	101	11.729		
	Total		1330.991	109			

The fourth and final political ideology variable analyzed was political scale using a conservative direction only using the questions that Congress should propose and the states should approve a constitutional amendment to outlaw abortion and Congress should propose and the states should ratify an amendment to the U.S. constitution outlawing gay marriage. All other political ideology questions were not used for this second political scale. The first Sig Value was political scale in a conservative direction only examining abortion rights and same sex marriage and punitive scale with a Sig Value of .072. The second Sig Value was political scale in a conservative direction only examining abortion rights and same sex marriage and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .103. The third Sig Value was political

scale in a conservative direction only examining abortion rights and same sex marriage and punitive scale that a juvenile should be tried as an adult with a Sig Value of .146. Since all three Sig Values were greater than .05; we can safely assume that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of variance for the independent variable of political ideology using a political scale in a conservative direction examining only abortion rights and same sex marriage and the dependent variable of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Linear Regression

Linear regression was the next statistical model which was used for analyzing the data that was collected for this project. Several linear regression models were run in the process of analyzing data through the use of SPSS.

The first linear regression model used the independent variables, predictor variables, of: television hours, traditional or non-traditional student, victimization scale (dichotomous variable), fear scale, and political scale (liberal direction). The independent variables were described previously in the data analysis section. The first linear regression model used the dependent variable of punitiveness scale. For the dependent variable of punitiveness scale, I used the scale that was described previously in the data analysis section.

Table 5a: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.449[a]	.202	.154	6.38204

a. Predictors: (Constant), Television Hours , Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Victimization Scale (Dichotomous), Fear Scale, Political Scale (Liberal Direction)

Table 5b: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	864.747	5	172.949	4.246	.002[b]
	Residual	3421.353	84	40.730		
	Total	4286.100	89			

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

b. Predictors: (Constant), Television Hours , Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Victimization Scale (Dichotomous), Fear Scale, Political Scale (Liberal Direction)

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	33.660	4.689		7.178	.000
	Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	-.412	.153	-.285	-2.699	.008
	Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	2.366	1.413	.171	1.674	.098
	Fear Scale	-.066	.080	-.085	-.830	.409
	Traditional and Non-Traditional Students	2.457	1.524	.163	1.612	.111
	Television Hours	.708	.637	.112	1.112	.269

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

The independent variables that were used in the first linear regression model explain 20.2% of the variability in the dependent variable according to the R Square in the model summary. The results are significant since Sig in the Anova Table is less than 0.05 with a Sig of .002.

The second linear regression model used the independent variables, predictor variables, of: size of town or geographic region in which you were primarily raised in, traditional or non-traditional student status, television hours, religious commitment, victimization scale (as a dichotomous variable), sex, political scale (liberal direction), race (coded as white or not white), fear scale, and age. The second linear regression model used the dependent variable of punitiveness scale.

Table 5c: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.484[a]	.234	.130	6.43773

a. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Television Hours , Religious Commitment, Victimization Scale (Dichotomous), Sex, Political Scale (Liberal Direction), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale, Age

Table 5d: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	936.697	10	93.670	2.260	.023[b]
	Residual	3066.879	74	41.444		
	Total	4003.576	84			

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

b. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Television Hours , Religious Commitment, Victimization Scale (Dichotomous), Sex, Political Scale (Liberal Direction), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale, Age

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	37.191	6.615		5.622	.000
	Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	-.358	.165	-.249	-2.167	.033
	Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	2.719	1.523	.197	1.785	.078
	Fear Scale	-.005	.100	-.006	-.046	.964
	Traditional and Non-Traditional Students	5.003	2.643	.332	1.893	.062
	Sex	-1.801	1.631	-.131	-1.104	.273
	Age	-.140	.216	-.115	-.651	.517
	Religious Commitment	-.246	.541	-.050	-.454	.651
	Television Hours	.792	.709	.123	1.116	.268
	Race (White - NonWhite)	-1.166	2.835	-.050	-.411	.682
	Urban - Rural	-.532	1.710	-.035	-.311	.757

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

The independent variables that were used in the second linear regression model explain 23.4% of the variability in the dependent variable according to the R Square in the model summary. The results are significant since Sig in the Anova Table is less than 0.05 with a Sig of .023.

The third linear regression model used the independent variables, predictor variables, of: size of town or geographic region in which you were primarily raised in, traditional or non-traditional student status, television hours, religious commitment, victimization scale (as a dichotomous variable), sex (as a dichotomous variable), political scale (liberal direction), race (coded as white or not white), fear scale, and age. The third linear regression model used the dependent variable of punitiveness scale.

Table 5e: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.479[a]	.230	.137	6.41296

a. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Television Hours , Religious Commitment, Victimization Scale (Dichotomous), Sex Dichotomous, Political Scale (Liberal Direction), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale

Table 5f: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	919.121	9	102.125	2.483	.015[b]
	Residual	3084.455	75	41.126		
	Total	4003.576	84			

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

b. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Television Hours , Religious Commitment, Victimization Scale (Dichotomous), Sex Dichotomous, Political Scale (Liberal Direction), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	32.681	4.853		6.734	.000
	Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	-.344	.163	-.240	-2.110	.038
	Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	2.737	1.517	.199	1.804	.075
	Fear Scale	-.009	.100	-.011	-.087	.931
	Traditional and Non-Traditional Students	3.670	1.667	.244	2.202	.031
	Sex Dichotomous	-1.768	1.624	-.128	-1.089	.280
	Religious Commitment	-.261	.539	-.053	-.484	.630
	Television Hours	.732	.701	.114	1.044	.300
	Race (White - NonWhite)	-1.378	2.805	-.059	-.491	.625
	Urban - Rural	-.421	1.695	-.028	-.248	.805

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

The independent variables that were used in the third linear regression model explain 23.0% of the variability in the dependent variable according to the R Square in the model summary. The results are significant since Sig in the Anova Table is less than 0.05 with a Sig of .015.

The fourth linear regression model used the independent variables, predictor variables, of: size of town or geographic region in which you were primarily raised in, traditional or non-traditional student status, television hours, political party identification (democrat or republican), religious commitment, victimization scale (as a dichotomous variable), sex, political scale (liberal direction), race (coded as white or not white), and fear scale. The fourth linear regression model used the dependent variable of punitiveness scale.

Table 5g: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.521[a]	.272	.126	6.73730

a. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Sex Dichotomous, Religious Commitment, Television Hours , Democrat or Republican, Victimization Scale (Dichotomous), Race (White - NonWhite), Fear Scale

Table 5h: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	762.924	9	84.769	1.868	.082[b]
	Residual	2042.603	45	45.391		
	Total	2805.527	54			

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

b. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Sex Dichotomous, Religious Commitment, Television Hours , Democrat or Republican, Victimization Scale (Dichotomous), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	23.917	4.860		4.922	.000
	Democrat or Republican	-5.457	2.142	-.374	-2.548	.014
	Victimization Scale (Dichotomous)	4.092	2.188	.281	1.870	.068
	Fear Scale	-.037	.143	-.046	-.262	.795
	Traditional and Non-Traditional Students	1.821	2.423	.114	.752	.456
	Sex Dichotomous	-.272	2.378	-.019	-.115	.909
	Religious Commitment	.365	.782	.070	.466	.643
	Television Hours	1.262	1.016	.170	1.242	.221
	Race (White - NonWhite)	-1.232	4.149	-.050	-.297	.768
	Urban - Rural	-.851	2.328	-.055	-.365	.717

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

The independent variables that were used in the fourth linear regression model explain 27.2% of the variability in the dependent variable according to the R Square in the model summary. The results are not significant since the Sig value of .082 in the ANOVA table is greater than 0.05.

The fifth linear regression model used the independent variables, predictor variables, of: size of town or geographic region in which you were primarily raised in, traditional or non-traditional student status, television hours, political party identification (democrat or republican), religious commitment, victimization scale (as a sum), race (coded as white or not white), and fear scale. The fifth linear regression model used the dependent variable of punitiveness scale.

Table 5i: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.512[a]	.262	.115	6.78273

a. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Sex Dichotomous, Religious Commitment, Television Hours , Democrat or Republican, Victimization Scale (Summed), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale

Table 5j: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	735.283	9	81.698	1.776	.100[b]
	Residual	2070.244	45	46.005		
	Total	2805.527	54			

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

b. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Sex Dichotomous, Religious Commitment, Television Hours , Democrat or Republican, Victimization Scale (Summed), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	23.420	4.863		4.816	.000
	Democrat or Republican	-5.423	2.156	-.372	-2.515	.016
	Victimization Scale (Summed)	.681	.403	.257	1.688	.098
	Fear Scale	.000	.142	.000	-.001	.999
	Traditional and Non-Traditional Students	2.329	2.410	.145	.966	.339
	Sex Dichotomous	-.632	2.419	-.043	-.261	.795
	Religious Commitment	.294	.785	.057	.375	.709
	Television Hours	1.449	1.008	.195	1.437	.158
	Race (White - NonWhite)	-1.541	4.190	-.062	-.368	.715
	Urban - Rural	-1.202	2.432	-.078	-.494	.624

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness Scale

The independent variables that were used in the fifth linear regression model explain 26.2% of the variability in the dependent variable according to the R Square in the model summary. The results are not significant since the Sig value of .100 in the ANOVA table is greater than 0.05.

The sixth linear regression model used the independent variables, predictor variables, of: size of town or geographic region in which you were primarily raised in, traditional or non-traditional student status, television hours, religious commitment, sex (as a dichotomous variable)victimization scale (as a sum), political scale (liberal

direction), race (coded as white or not white), and fear scale. The sixth linear regression model used the dependent variable of Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult.

Table 5k: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.470[a]	.221	.128	3.27188

a. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Television Hours , Religious Commitment, Sex Dichotomous, Victimization Scale (Summed), Political Scale (Liberal Direction), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale

Table 5l: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	227.861	9	25.318	2.365	.021[b]
	Residual	802.892	75	10.705		
	Total	1030.753	84			

a. Dependent Variable: Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult

b. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Television Hours , Religious Commitment, Sex Dichotomous, Victimization Scale (Summed), Political Scale (Liberal Direction), Race (White - Nonwhite), Fear Scale

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	10.355	2.455		4.217	.000
	Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	-.194	.083	-.267	-2.354	.021
	Victimization Scale (Summed)	.340	.146	.259	2.332	.022
	Fear Scale	.036	.050	.090	.722	.472
	Traditional and Non-Traditional Students	1.178	.852	.154	1.383	.171
	Sex Dichotomous	-.996	.834	-.143	-1.195	.236
	Religious Commitment	-.135	.274	-.054	-.491	.625
	Television Hours	.303	.358	.093	.846	.400
	Race (White - NonWhite)	-1.062	1.459	-.089	-.728	.469
	Urban - Rural	-.664	.870	-.086	-.763	.448

a. Dependent Variable: Scale - Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult

The independent variables that were used in the sixth linear regression model explain 22.1% of the variability in the dependent variable according to the R Square in the model summary. The results are significant since the Sig value of .021 is less than 0.05.

The seventh and final linear regression model used the independent variables, predictor variables, of: size of town or geographic region in which you were primarily raised in, traditional or non-traditional student status, television hours, religious commitment, sex (as a dichotomous variable) victimization scale (as a sum), political scale (liberal direction), race (coded as white or not white), and fear scale. The seventh linear regression model used the dependent variable of Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult.

Table 5m: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.415[a]	.172	.075	3.39972

a. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Television Hours , Religious Commitment, Sex Dichotomous, Victimization Scale (Summed), Political Scale (Liberal Direction), Race (White - NonWhite), Fear Scale

Table 5n: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	184.880	9	20.542	1.777	.086[b]
	Residual	889.971	77	11.558		
	Total	1074.851	86			

a. Dependent Variable: Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult

b. Predictors: (Constant), Urban - Rural, Traditional and Non-Traditional Students, Television Hours , Religious Commitment, Sex Dichotomous, Victimization Scale (Summed), Political Scale (Liberal Direction), Race (White - NonWhite), Fear Scale

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11.819	2.507		4.714	.000
	Political Scale (Liberal Direction)	-.124	.085	-.167	-1.453	.150
	Victimization Scale (Summed)	.134	.151	.101	.892	.375
	Fear Scale	-.032	.050	-.080	-.645	.521
	Traditional and Non-Traditional Students	1.645	.863	.212	1.905	.060
	Sex Dichotomous	-.681	.838	-.097	-.813	.419
	Religious Commitment	-.314	.278	-.126	-1.128	.263
	Television Hours	.469	.369	.143	1.270	.208
	Race (White - NonWhite)	.853	1.376	.074	.620	.537
	Urban - Rural	.076	.887	.010	.086	.932

a. Dependent Variable: Scale - Juveniles Should be Sentenced as Adult

The independent variables that were used in the seventh linear regression model explain 17.2% of the variability in the dependent variable according to the R Square in the model summary. The results are not significant since the Sig value of .086 is greater than 0.05.

Ordinal Logistic Regression

Ordinal logistic regression was the final statistical model which was used for analyzing the data that was collected for this project. Several ordinal logistical regression models were run in the process of analyzing data through the use of SPSS.

Table 6a: Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	561.911			
Final	524.010	37.901	24	.035

Link function: Logit.

Table 6b: Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	2012.132	2104	.923
Deviance	501.358	2104	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Table 6c: Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.335
Nagelkerke	.335
McFadden	.065

Link function: Logit.

The first limited ordinal logistical regression model ran tested the predictability of the dependent variable of punitiveness using two explanatory variables, independent variables, which were the political scale in a liberal direction and victimization as a dichotomous variable. The first statistic examined in Table 6a is whether the information provided in SPSS improves the model that we are examining. SPSS "compares a model without any explanatory variables (the baseline or Intercept Only Model) against the model with all the explanatory variables…we compare the final model against the baseline to see whether it has significantly improved the fit to the data". The Sig Level in Table 6a explains whether or not the fit to the data is statistically significant and a Sig Level of >0.05 would indicate that we have significantly improved the fit to the data that was provided within SPSS. The Sig Level in Table 6a for this first limited Ordinal Regression Model is a Sig Level of .035 which means that we have significantly improved the fit to the data. Table 6b examines whether or not the null hypothesis can be rejected and that the data provided in SPSS and the predictions that we have made within our model are similar; therefore, we have a good model if we have a Sig Value of 0.05 or higher. Sig Values of less than 0.05 indicate that the model that has been provided does not fit the data very well. Table 6b shows a Sig Value of .923 and since the Sig Value is greater than 0.05 we have a good model using political scale in a liberal direction and victimization as a dichotomous variable as explanatory variables for the variation in answers given by students for the dependent variable of punitiveness.

The Pseudo R-Square in Table 6c uses three different tests that are used in order to assess how strong the association is between the dependent variable of punitiveness and the predictor variables of political scale in a liberal direction and victimization as a dichotomous variable. The Pseudo R-Squares can also be considered as the level of which the independent, predictor, variables explain the dependent variable. The first Pseudo R-Square in table 6c is the Cox and Snell test with a value of .335 which means that the independent variables of political scale in a liberal direction and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 33.5% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness. The second Pseudo R-Square in Table 6c is the Nagelkerke test with a value of .335 which means that the independent variables of political scale in a liberal direction and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 33.5% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness. The third Pseudo R-Square in table 6c is the McFadden test with a value of .065 which means that the independent variables of political scale in a liberal direction and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 6.5% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness. For the McFadden test; values of .2-.4 are considered to be highly satisfactory.

Table 6d: Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	269.283			
Final	254.919	14.364	4	.006

Link function: Logit.

Table 6e: Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	518.563	480	.109
Deviance	205.316	480	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Table 6f: Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.219
Nagelkerke	.220
McFadden	.042

Link function: Logit.

The second limited ordinal logistical regression model ran tested the predictability of the dependent variable of punitiveness using two explanatory variables, independent variables, political party self-identification coded as either a Democrat or Republican and victimization as a dichotomous variable. The first statistic examined in Table 6d is whether the information provided in SPSS improves the model that we are examining. The Sig Value in table 6d for Model Fitting Information indicates a Sig Level of .006 and is statistically significant since the Sig Value significantly improved the fit to the data that was provided within SPSS. Table 6e shows the Goodness of Fit with a Sig Value of .109. Since the Sig Value is greater than .05 we have a good model using political party identification coded as Democrat or Republican and victimization as a dichotomous variable as explanatory variables for the variation in answers given by students for the dependent variable of punitiveness. The first Pseudo R-Square in table 6f is the Cox and Snell test with a value of .219 which means that the independent variables of political party identification coded as Democrat or Republican and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 21.9% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness. The second Pseudo R-Square in Table 6f is the Nagelkerke test with a value of .220 which means that the independent variables of political party identification coded as a Democrat or Republican and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 22.0% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness using this test. The third Pseudo R-Square in table 6f is the McFadden test with a value of .042 which means that the independent variables of political party identification coded as a Democrat or Republican and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 4.2% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness.

Table 6g: Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	493.321			
Final	471.120	22.201	7	.002

Link function: Logit.

Table 6h: Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	1217.551	1281	.896
Deviance	403.363	1281	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Table 6i: Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.212
Nagelkerke	.213
McFadden	.038

Link function: Logit.

The third limited ordinal logistical regression model ran tested the predictability of the dependent variable of punitiveness using two explanatory variables self-identification as a liberal and victimization as a dichotomous variable. The first statistic examined in Table 6g is whether the information provided in SPSS improves the model that we are examining. The Sig Value in table 6g for Model Fitting Information indicates a Sig Level of .002 and is statistically significant since the Sig Value is less than 0.05 which indicates that I have significantly improved the fit to the data that was provided within SPSS. Table 6h shows the Goodness of Fit with a Sig Value of .896. Since the Sig Value is greater than .05 we have a good model using self identification as a liberal and victimization as a dichotomous variable as explanatory variables for the variation in answers given by students for the dependent variable of punitiveness. The first Pseudo R-Square in table 6i is the Cox and Snell test with a value of .212 which means that the independent variables of self-identification as a liberal and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 21.2% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness. The second Pseudo R-Square in Table 6i is the Nagelkerke test with a value of .213 which means that the independent variables of self-identification as a liberal and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 21.3% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness using this test. The third Pseudo R-Square in table 6i is the McFadden test with a value of .038 which means that the independent variables of self-identification as a liberal and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 3.8% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness.

Table 6j: Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	505.467			
Final	485.987	19.479	7	.007

Link function: Logit.

Table 6k: Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	1429.367	1365	.110
Deviance	423.535	1365	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Table 6l: Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.189
Nagelkerke	.189
McFadden	.033

Link function: Logit.

The fourth limited ordinal logistical regression model ran tested the predictability of the dependent variable of punitiveness using two explanatory variables self-identification as a conservative and victimization as a dichotomous variable. The first statistic examined in Table 6j is whether the information provided in SPSS improves the model that we are examining. The Sig Value in table 6j for Model Fitting Information indicates a Sig Level of .007 and is statistically significant since the Sig Value is less than 0.05 which indicates that I have significantly improved the fit to the data that was provided within SPSS. Table 6k shows the Goodness of Fit with a Sig Value of .110. Since the Sig Value is greater than .05 we have a good model using self identification as a conservative and victimization as a dichotomous variable as explanatory variables for the variation in answers given by students for the dependent variable of punitiveness; however, this is not as strong as it is for self-identification with being a conservative and victimization as a dichotomous variable. The first Pseudo R-Square in table 6l is the Cox and Snell test with a value of .189 which means that the independent variables of self-

identification as a liberal and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 18.9% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness. The second Pseudo R-Square in Table 6l is the Nagelkerke test with a value of .189 which means that the independent variables of self-identification as a conservative and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 18.9% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness using this test. The third Pseudo R-Square in table 6l is the McFadden test with a value of .033 which means that the independent variables of self-identification as a conservative and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 3.3% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness.

Table 6m: Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	468.245			
Final	450.071	18.174	7	.011

Link function: Logit.

Table 6n: Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	1103.913	1085	.338
Deviance	371.209	1085	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Table 6o: Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.178
Nagelkerke	.178
McFadden	.031

Link function: Logit.

The fifth and final limited ordinal logistical regression model ran tested the predictability of the dependent variable of punitiveness using two explanatory variables self-identification as a moderate and victimization as a dichotomous variable. The first statistic examined in Table 6m is whether the information provided in SPSS improves the model that we are examining. The Sig Value in table 6m for Model Fitting Information indicates a Sig Level of .011 and is statistically significant since the Sig Value is less than 0.05 which indicates that I have significantly improved the fit to the data that was provided within SPSS. Table 6n shows the Goodness of Fit with a Sig Value of .338.

Since the Sig Value is greater than .05 we have a good model using self identification as a moderate and victimization as a dichotomous variable as explanatory variables for the variation in answers given by students for the dependent variable of punitiveness. The first Pseudo R-Square in table 6o is the Cox and Snell test with a value of .178 which means that the independent variables of self-identification as a liberal and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 17.8% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness. The second Pseudo R-Square in Table 6l is the Nagelkerke test with a value of .178 which means that the independent variables of self-identification as a conservative and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 17.8% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness using this test. The third Pseudo R-Square in table 6l is the McFadden test with a value of .031 which means that the independent variables of self-identification as a moderate and victimization as a dichotomous variable explain 3.1% of the variation in the dependent variable of punitiveness.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The current study focused on further examining and understanding the punitive nature of juvenile delinquency amongst a select group of college students. Punitive attitudes were defined within the current study based on, and expanding on, the conceptualization used by Schwartz (1993) as the legal processing of juveniles in adult criminal courts, sentencing juveniles as adults, and sentencing of juveniles to adult prisons. The findings from the current study suggest that the main predictors of punitiveness are political ideology, victimization, and political party identification. In this section, I will discuss the findings for each of the variables examined in the current study.

Political Ideology

The first research question that guided the current study focused on political ideology as one explanation for punitiveness by attempting to answer the question as to whether or not a student's political ideology influences their opinion(s) on the juvenile justice system. I hypothesized that students who identify with a conservative political ideology were likely to be more punitive than students who do identify with a liberal political ideology; furthermore, students who identify with a liberal political ideology would be less likely to be punitive than students who identify with a conservative political ideology. The bivariate analysis results tend to show support for this first research question and hypothesis. Students who self-identified as a conservative were more likely to believe that a juvenile charged with a serious violent offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level), were more likely to believe that a juvenile convicted of a serious property offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01 level), were more likely to believe that a juvenile convicted of a serious drug offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01 level), and a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant ant the 0.01 level). Furthermore, students who self-identified as a conservative were more likely to hold punitive beliefs as identified with positive correlations with the punitive scale created for juveniles should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), positively correlated with the punitive scale created for juveniles should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly

significant at the 0.01 level), and the punitive scale created for all variables used for punitive attitudes (highly significant at the 0.01 level). No significant bivariate relationships were discovered between students who self-identify as a conservative and the beliefs that a juvenile accused of a crime should receive the same due process rights as an adult, the main purpose of the juvenile justice system should be treatment and rehabilitation, the main purpose of the juvenile justice system should be punishment, a juvenile charged with a serious property offense should be tried as an adult, and a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult.

Students who self-identified as liberal were more likely to believe that the primary goal of the juvenile justice should be treatment and rehabilitation as opposed to punishment (highly significant at the 0.01 level), less likely to believe that a juvenile charged with a serious property offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level), less likely to believe that a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), less likely to believe that a juvenile charged with a serious violent offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level), and less likely to believe that a juvenile convicted of a serious property offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.05 level). Furthermore, students who self-identified as a liberal were less likely to hold punitive beliefs as identified with negative correlations with the punitive scale created for juveniles should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), negatively correlated with the punitive scale created for juveniles should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.01 level), and negative correlated with the punitive scale created for all variables used for punitive attitudes (highly significant at the 0.01 level). No significant bivariate relationships were discovered between students who self-identify as a liberal and a belief that juveniles should receive the same due process rights as an adult, that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be punishment, that a juvenile convicted of a serious drug offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison, and that a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison.

Since individual political ideologies cannot be neatly dichotomized as either liberal or conservative; the current study also examined students who self-identify as a

moderate. Students who self-identify as a moderate were more likely to believe that a juvenile convicted of a serious drug offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01 level) and were more likely to believe that a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level). Furthermore, students who self-identified as a moderate were more likely to hold punitive beliefs as identified with positive correlations with the punitive scale created for juveniles should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01 level). No significant bivariate relationships were discovered between students who self-identify as a moderate and a belief that juveniles should receive the same due process rights as an adult, that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be treatment and rehabilitation, that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be punishment, a juvenile charged with a serious property offense should be tried as an adult, a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult, a juvenile charged with a serious violent offense should be tried as an adult, and a juvenile convicted of a serious property offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison. In addition to the lack of either significant positive or significant negative relationships; no significant relationships were discovered for the punitive scales used for juveniles should be tried as an adult or the punitive scale used for all variables used for punitive attitudes.

Although, the current study focused on examining and further understanding punitive attitudes among college students; the bivariate relationships were extremely interesting as it related to self-identification as a conservative, moderate, and liberal. No positive or negative correlations existed between the self-identification variables of conservative, moderate, and liberal with the belief that any raise in the federal minimum wage is unnecessary and will hurt small business and that the government should cut taxes for citizens even if it means that some government programs will not be funded. The only variables which were used for political ideology which positively correlated with the self-identification variable of conservative at a significant level were the variables that were used for abortion and same sex marriage. Students who self-identified as a conservative were more likely to believe that Congress should propose and the states should approve a constitutional amendment to outlaw abortion and Congress should

propose and the states should ratify an amendment to the U.S. constitution outlawing gay marriage.

It is interesting to note that these were the only two variables which correlated, either in a positive or negative direction, with self-identifying as a conservative. I would have expected to have seen a significant positive correlation with the beliefs that any raise in the federal minimum wage is unnecessary and will hurt small business, the government should cut taxes for citizens even if it means that some government programs will not be funded with students self-identifying as a conservative. Furthermore, I would have expected to have seen a significant negative correlation with the beliefs that the death penalty is immoral and should never be used by the government, there should be more money in our federal budget for environmental regulations, universal right to healthcare is a fundamental right which government should guarantee for all citizens, and it is the responsibility of government to provide assistance to the poor and needy with students self-identifying as a conservative.

There were more variables used for political ideology which were significantly correlated, either in a positive or negative direction, with self-identification as a liberal as opposed to significant correlations with self-identification as a liberal. The variables which were positively correlated with self-identification as a liberal were the variables used for the death penalty, the environment, healthcare and the poor. Students who self-identified as a liberal were more likely to believe that the death penalty is immoral and should never be used by the government, there should be more money in our federal budget for environmental regulations, universal right to healthcare is a fundamental right which government should guarantee for all citizens and it is the responsibility of government to provide assistance to the poor and needy. The only variable which was negatively correlated with self-identification as a liberal was the variable used for abortion. Students who self-identified as a liberal were less likely to believe that Congress should propose and the states should approve a constitutional amendment to outlaw abortion. All of the significant positive correlations I would have expected with self-identification as a liberal were discovered when conducting the bivariate analysis of the data; however, there were significant negative correlations that I would have expected to appear in the data that were not evident. I would have expected a significant negative

correlation with the beliefs that: any raise in the federal minimum wage is unnecessary and will hurt small business, the government should cut taxes for citizens even if it means that some government programs will not be funded, and Congress should propose and the states should ratify an amendment to the U.S. constitution outlawing gay marriage.

The only political variables which were significantly correlated with self-identification as a moderate, either in a positive or negative direction, was with a significant positive correlation with the self-identification variable of conservative. What this means is that there were some students who strongly believed that they see themselves as both a conservative and as a moderate which appears to be a contradictory relationship as it relates to political ideology.

In order to better examine the relationship between political ideology and punitive attitudes, four different scales were created through the use of the political ideology questions as discussed previously in this section and earlier during the findings and results section. The first political scale created was coded as Lib Scale 1 and included the variables of outlawing abortion (re-coded from its original conservative wording to match the liberal scale), death penalty, environment, health care, and assisting the poor. These were the variables included in Lib Scale 1 as they were the only variables significantly correlated to the self-identification variable of liberal. The second political scale created was coded as Lib Scale 2 which included all of the variables which were included in Lib Scale 1 and the inclusion of the variable for gay marriage which was also re-coded from its conservative wording. The third political scale created was coded as Pol. Scale and was a political scale which included all variables studied and included for political ideology with all variables recorded for a liberal direction. The fourth political scale created was coded as Con. Scale and was a political scale which included the variables of abortion and gay marriage as these were the only variables which were significantly correlated with the self-identification variable of conservative.

The results of the bivariate analysis which were positively correlated with Lib Scale 1 at a significant level were the belief that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be treatment and rehabilitation (highly significant at the 0.01 level). The results of the bivariate analysis which were negatively correlated with Lib Scale 1 at a significant level were the beliefs that: the primary goal of the juvenile justice system

should be punishment (significant at the 0.05 level), a juvenile charged with a serious property offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile charged with a serious violent offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile convicted of a serious property offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level), and a juvenile convicted of a serious drug offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level). The lone exception for correlations with punitive variables was with the variable that a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison where a significant relationship did not exist with Lib Scale 1. This result is interesting since students who were identified as having a liberal political ideology generally believed that a juvenile should not be tried as an adult; however, the support for not having juveniles serve their sentence in an adult prison begins to go down when looking at levels of significance. Furthermore, Lib Scale 1 was negatively correlated, at a significant level, with the punitive scale that was created for trying juveniles as adults (highly significant at the 0.01 level), the punitive scale that was created for sentencing juveniles to serve time in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level), and the punitive scale that was created for all punitive variables (highly significant at the 0.01 level). The only other belief that was not significantly correlated with Lib Scale 1 was the belief that a juvenile charged with a crime should receive the same due process rights as an adult.

The results of the bivariate analysis which were positively correlated with Lib Scale 2 at a significant level were the beliefs that juveniles charged with a crime should receive the same due process rights as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level), and that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be treatment and rehabilitation (highly significant at the 0.01 level). The results of the bivariate analysis which were negatively correlated with Lib Scale 2 at a significant level were the beliefs that: a juvenile charged with a serious property offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile charged with a serious violent offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile convicted of a serious

property offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level), and a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level). As with Lib Scale 1, students who were identified as believing in a political ideology typically believe that we should steer away from trying juveniles as adults; however, the belief is not as strong when it comes to having juveniles serving their sentence in an adult prison. In addition to the individual variables discussed, Lib Scale 1 was negatively correlated, at a significant level, with the punitive scale created for trying juveniles as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), the punitive scale created for sentencing juveniles to serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level), and the punitive scale created for all variables (highly significant at the 0.01 level). The only belief which did not have a statistically significant relationship, either in a positive or negative direction, was the belief that punishment should be the primary goal of the juvenile justice system in addition to a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison, as discussed previously.

The results of the bivariate analysis which were positively correlated with Pol. Scale at a significant level were the belief that treatment and rehabilitation should be the primary goal of the juvenile justice system (highly significant at the 0.01 level). The results of the bivariate analysis which were negatively correlated with Pol. Scale at a significant level were the beliefs that: a juvenile charged with a serious property offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile charged with a serious violent offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), a juvenile convicted of a serious drug offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01 level), and a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level).

The fourth and final bivariate analysis which were positively correlated with the Con Scale at a significant level were the beliefs that a juvenile charged with a serious property offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level), a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05

level), a juvenile charged with a serious violent offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level), a juvenile convicted of a serious property offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level) and a juvenile convicted of a serious drug offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01 level). What is interesting is that the conservative scale created was significantly correlated with the belief that a juvenile convicted of a serious property and drug offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison; however, the belief that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison for committing a serious violent offense did not reach a significant level. The Conservative Scale was also positively correlated with the punitive scale created for trying juveniles as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level), the punitive scale created for sentencing juveniles to serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01level), and the punitive scale created for all punitive variables (highly significant at the 0.01 level).

The study utilized ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) to test for a statistically significant relationship between political ideology and punitiveness. Self-identification as a liberal explained the level of variance in punitiveness when examining the punitive scales which included all punitive variables, with 12.0% of the variance explained, and the punitiveness scale created for trying juveniles as adults, with 16.0% of the variance explained; however, self-identification as a liberal does not explain the level of variance in punitiveness for the scale created for sentencing juveniles to serve their sentence in an adult prison. Self-identification as a conservative explained the level of variance in punitiveness when examining the punitive scales which included all punitive variables, with 11.6% of the variance explained, the punitiveness scale created for trying juveniles as adults, with 8.8% of the variance explained, and the scale that was created for sentencing juveniles to serve their sentence in an adult prison, with 15.4% of the variance explained. The political scales that were created using two different scales, one scale for political ideology in a liberal direction and one scale for a conservative direction had no effect on explaining the levels of variance for the punitive scales that were used in this analysis.

The results of the linear regression show differing levels of statistically significant variance when using political ideology as a predictor variable coupled with other predictor variables with explanations for variance ranging from 17.2%-27.2%.

The models used for ordinal logistical regression included political ideology and victimization as a dichotomous variable. The first model used the predictor variables of political scale in a liberal direction and victimization as a dichotomous variable as an explanation for punitiveness. This first model was significant and explains 33.5% of the variance (Cox and Snell), 33.5% of the variance (Nagelkerke), and 6.5% of the variance (McFadden). The second model used the predictor variables of self-identification as a liberal and victimization as a dichotomous variable as an explanation for punitiveness. The second model was significant and explains 21.2% of the variance (Cox and Snell), 21.3% of the variance (Nagelkerke), and 3.8% of the variance (McFadden). The third model used the predictor variables of self-identification as a conservative and victimization as a dichotomous variable as an explanation for punitiveness. The third model was significant and explains 18.9% of the variance (Cox and Snell), 18.9% of the variance (Nagelkerke), and 3.3% of the variance (McFadden). The fourth model used the predictor variables of self-identification as a moderate and victimization as a dichotomous variable as an explanation for punitiveness. The fourth model was significant and explains 17.8% of the variance (Cox and Snell), 17.8% of the variance (Nagelkerke), and 3.1% of the variance (McFadden).

The results of this study typically align with other studies (Baron and Hartnagel 1996, Mackey and Courtright 2000, Nagin et al. 2006, Falco 2008, and Dozier 2009) which used political ideology as an explanation for punitiveness and an explanation for opinions related to juvenile delinquency and the juvenile justice system among members of the general population and for opinions related to the criminal justice system, juvenile delinquency, and the juvenile justice system among college students. The results contrast with the research conducted by Piquero et al. (2010) and Perelman and Clements (2009) which showed that political ideology did not influence punitiveness and attitudes towards juvenile delinquency and/or the criminal justice system.

The theoretical framework which was used in this study by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) was based on the previous work of Scheingold (1984) which proposed

that political ideology is one explanation for punitiveness and punitive attitudes and the results of the current study support this theoretical framework. Langworthy and Whitehead believe that students who identify with a liberal political ideology would be less punitive than students who identify with a conservative political ideology. The results generally showed that students who self-identified as liberal, or were identified with a liberal political ideology, typically tended to be less punitive when it comes to trying juveniles as adults for serious property offenses, serious drug offenses, and serious violent offenses. Students self-identified as liberal and identified as sympathetic to a liberal political ideology also typically did not support the idea of sentencing juveniles to adult prisons for serious property and drug offenses. However, this lack of support did not extend to serious violent offenses. Students who self-identify as a liberal and/or identify with a liberal political ideology also typically tended to believe in the idea of treatment and rehabilitation as opposed to punishment. The political scale in a liberal direction was less reliable according to the results from ANOVA testing and failed to reach statistically significant results in explaining levels of variance in explaining punitiveness. Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) believe that students who self-identify or identify with a conservative political ideology would be more punitive than students who self-identify as a liberal or identify with a liberal political ideology. The results generally showed that students who self-identified as conservative; or, were identified with a conservative political ideology tended to be more punitive when it came to trying juveniles as adults for serious property offenses and serious drug offenses, when using a conservative scale, trying juveniles as adults for violent offenses, and sentencing juveniles to adult prisons for serious property, drug, and violent offenses. These results did not extend to the punitive scale used for trying juveniles as adults when taking into account all three punitive variables for trying juveniles as adults. The conservative scales was less reliable according to the results from ANOVA testing and failed to reach statistically significant results in explaining levels of variance in explaining punitiveness.

Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) do not talk as much about political ideologies which do not neatly fit into conservative or liberal and Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) describe these ideologies as moderate conservatives. The current study did examine students who would self-identify as a moderate or would identify with a

moderate political ideology. The only significant relationships which existed between students who self-identify as a moderate and the variables used for punitiveness in the current study were: sentencing a juvenile convicted of serious drug offenses should serve their sentence in an adult prison, sentencing a juvenile convicted of serious violent offenses should serve their sentence in an adult prison, and the punitive scale created for sentencing juveniles to serve their sentence in an adult prison. This was contrary to the expectation that moderates would be less willing to have juveniles serve their sentence in an adult prison. An additional interesting observation is that the self-identify variable of moderate failed to reach levels of significance for the beliefs that juveniles charged with serious property offenses, serious drug offenses, and serious violent offenses should be tried as adults. One would have expected to see these three reach levels of significance in a positive direction.

As noted earlier in the discussion section related to bivariate relationships between political ideology and punitiveness, the only relationships which existed between self-identification as conservative and the variables used for political ideology were outlawing abortion and a constitutional amendment prohibiting same sex marriage. Also, not all political variables were significantly related to self-identification as a liberal as what would have been expected. The significance of this is that the issues and positions that one would typically expect to see with being sympathetic to conservatives and liberals may not easily be categorized into these labels. Future research should take this into consideration that while students may declare themselves to be either a liberal or a conservative, they may not always know what it truly means to be a conservative or a liberal. It is quite possible that students are not familiar enough with the issues that makes one a conservative or which makes one a liberal and that these viewpoints may take fruition later on. This may also be true for members of the general population as well. Future research should create a political scale that is a better match for conservative and liberal political ideologies.

Fear of Victimization

The second research question that guided the current study focused on fear of victimization as a second explanation for punitiveness by attempting to answer the question whether or not a fear of victimization influences college student's opinions on

the juvenile justice system. I hypothesized that students who are more fearful of being victimized would be more punitive; furthermore, students who are less fearful of being victimized would be less punitive.

According to the theoretical framework by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986), in addition to political ideology as one explanation for punitiveness, fear of victimization is an additional explanation for punitiveness. Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) form this belief based on the work by Sheley (1985). Sheley (1985) believes that fear of victimization explains punitiveness, however the results of the current study do not support this idea. When analyzing the data through the use of bivariate relationships, the only significant relationship which was discovered was that a fear of being robbed was negatively correlated, at a significant level, with a belief that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be punishment. No other statistically significant relationships were discovered through the analysis of the data when examining bivariate relationships. In addition to a lack of statistically significant bivariate relationships, the results of the current study show a lack of support for fear of victimization as being significantly related to variance in explaining punitiveness. In all of the regression models, fear of victimization was statistically significant in only one model using Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult as the dependent variable. The fear scale was not significant in any of the regression models. Fear of victimization was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression due to a lack of significant support for fear of victimization as being related to punitiveness when analyzing the data through bivariate relationships and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

The results of this study continue to add to the ambiguity of fear of victimization as a theoretical explanation for punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The results of previous research conducted by Baron and Hartnagel (1996) and Falco (2008) support the results in the current study that fear of victimization does not explain punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The results of previous research conducted by Schwartz (1993) and Dozier (2009) contrast with the results of the current study by finding that fear of victimization was significantly associated with punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Because it may possible that college students are not as fearful of being the victims of criminal acts, researchers may wish to account for age or student status when explaining

punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Additional research should be conducted to examine the impact of fear of victimization on punitiveness with populations consisting of both the general public and college students in order to test the strength or weaknesses of the theoretical framework presented by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and Shelley (1985).

Demographic Attitudinal Variables

The third and final research question which guided the current study was the influence of demographic characteristics and attitudes on punitive attitudes. The current study examined the effect of political ideology and fear of victimization on punitiveness and punitive attitudes, but also examined the influences of gender, race/ethnicity, academic level, whether a student was an international student or not, the geographic region in which a student was primarily raised, and victimization. All of the variables examined had been tested in previous research with the exception of the variable for international students, therefore these variables were also used in order to further the current understanding that we have on explanations for punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Gender

The first demographic variable which was examined in the current study was the effect gender has on punitiveness and punitive attitudes towards the juvenile justice system. The results of the bivariate analysis showed a lack of statistically significant support that gender influences punitiveness and punitive attitudes. In addition to a lack of statistically significant bivariate relationships, the results of the current study show a lack of support for gender as being significantly related to variance in explaining punitiveness discovered through analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). The results of the linear regression shows gender was not significant in any of the regression models tested. Gender was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression due to a lack of significant support for gender as being related to punitiveness when analyzing the data through bivariate relationships and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

This finding was interesting since it differs from results obtained in other research on the topic of attitudes and opinions about the juvenile justice system and the criminal justice system (Skovron et al. 1989, Schwartz et al. 1993, Benekos et al. 2002, Nagin et

al. 2006, Applegate et al. 2009, Dozier 2009, and Piquero et al. 2010). The results in the current study were similar to the results obtained in the research by Mackey and Courtright (2000) and Perelman and Clements (2009, although, the results of the research conducted by Perelman and Clements (2009) were close to reaching levels of significance but did not. Based on the previous research, gender should have been correlated with punitiveness and punitive attitudes, but was not in the current study.

Race/Ethnicity

The second demographic variable in the current study was the impact race/ethnicity has on punitiveness and punitive attitudes towards the juvenile justice system. The results of the bivariate analysis showed a lack of statistically significant support that race/ethnicity influences punitiveness and punitive attitudes. In addition to a lack of statistically significant bivariate relationships, the results of the current study show a lack of support for race/ethnicity explaining punitiveness through analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). The results of the linear regression found no models where race/ethnicity was statistically significant. Race/ethnicity was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression due to a lack of significant support for race/ethnicity as being related to punitiveness when analyzing the data through bivariate relationships and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

The results of the current study are consistent with the results of research conducted by Skovron et al. (1989), Mackey and Courtright (2000), Benekos et al. (2002), Applegate et al. (2009), and Piquero et al. (2010). Not all of the research has shown a lack of significant results for the effect of race/ethnicity on punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Research conducted by Schwartz et al. (1993) is mixed when it comes to the effect of race/ethnicity. Schwartz et al. (1993) discovered that African Americans were less punitive; but, African American parents were more punitive. Research conducted by Piquero and Steinberg (2010) showed that race significantly impacted punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The results typically tend to show that race/ethnicity does not significantly impact punitiveness and punitive attitudes and the results of the current study are consistent with this conclusion.

Academic Level

The third demographic variable which was examined in the current study was the impact that academic level has on punitiveness and punitive attitudes towards the juvenile justice system. The results of the bivariate analysis demonstrated a lack of statistically significant support that academic level influences punitiveness and punitive attitudes. In addition to a lack of statistically significant bivariate relationships, the results of the current study show a lack of support for the significance of academic level in the analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). The results of the linear regression found Traditional and Non-Traditional significant in only one regression model (Punitiveness Scale as dependent variable), and only after age was removed from the model. Academic level was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression due to a lack of significant support for academic level as being related to punitiveness when analyzing the data through bivariate relationships and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Of the research that has examined the role that academic level affects punitiveness and punitive attitudes; the results have been mixed and the results of the current study furthers the ambiguity that exists as to the effect of academic level on punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Research conducted by Farnworth, et al. (1998) and Falco, (2008) have shown positive relationships when it comes to academic level and punitiveness. The results of the current study are supported by the research conducted by Benekos et al. (2002). The results of the current study may have been influenced by conducting the study at a community college where most students would fall into the academic ranks of either freshman and/or sophomore, opposed to a four year university or college where students would follow the typical range of freshman to senior and even graduate students. Further research in examining the opinions and beliefs of college students on issues related to the juvenile justice system and the criminal justice system should continue to examine whether academic level is a statistically significant variable in explaining the opinions of college students.

International Student

The fourth demographic variable examined in the current study was the effect of international student status, a student who has come to the United States from another country to study abroad, on punitiveness and punitive attitudes towards the juvenile

justice system. The results of the bivariate analysis showed a lack of statistically significant support that being an international student influences punitiveness and punitive attitudes. In addition to a lack of statistically significant bivariate relationships, the results of the current study show a lack of support that being an international student is significantly in analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). Whether a student as an international student or not was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression due to a lack of significant support for international student as being related to punitiveness when analyzing the data through bivariate relationships and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

This is a variable that I believe had not been explored in previous research examining the attitudes and opinions of college students related to topics concerning the juvenile justice system, juvenile delinquency, and the criminal justice system. Although, the results of the current study showed that this did not significantly influence punitive attitudes, it is a variable that should be of continued interest in future research. The reason why it is a variable that should be of continued interest is it would be interesting to see if a difference exists in the opinions of those who come from other countries with students who are born and raised in the United States. It is very possible that future research may show that students who come to the United States have different opinions than those who come from outside the United States. I believe the reason why the results did not show a significant different in the current study is due to a small number of international students who were included in the population studied in the current study.

Age

The fifth demographic variable examined in the current study was the impact age has on punitiveness and punitive attitudes towards the juvenile justice system. Most of the results of the bivariate analysis showed a lack of statistically significant support for the idea that age influences punitiveness and punitive attitudes with one exception. The one exception to the findings is a statistically significant bivariate relationship with the variable used for treatment and rehabilitation. The results showed a significantly significant negative correlation with a belief that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be treatment and rehabilitation (significant at the 0.05 level). In addition to a lack of statistically significant bivariate relationships with most punitive variables, the

results of the current study show a lack of support that age is significantly related in the analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). Depending upon the linear regression model used, age was either kept as age or was dichotomized into traditional and nontraditional status. Age was not significant, but traditional and nontraditional status was significant in one model, mentioned above. Age was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression due to a lack of significant support for age as being related to punitiveness when analyzing the data through bivariate relationships and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

The results of the current study continue to add to the ambiguity of the effect age has with punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The results of the current study confirm the results of previous research conducted by Skovron et al. (1989), Mackey and Courtright (2000), and Applegate et al. (2009). Results of these studies showed a lack of statistically significant support for age influencing punitiveness and punitive attitudes, however, as with most research, the results are mixed on this topic. Results of research conducted by Mackey and Courtright (2000), Applegate and Davis (2006), Piquero et al. (2010), and Piquero and Steinberg (2010) showed statistically significant support for age influencing punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The results of the research by Mackey and Courtright (2000) showed highly statistically significant results for age influencing punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The results of the research showed by Applegate and Davis (2006) showed that younger respondents were more punitive and that as age increases, punitiveness and punitive attitudes decreased and these results were statistically significant. Since most of the students who were surveyed in the current study were students who would be traditional college students, the results of the study may reflect the limited age sample. It is worth noting that the studies which examined age were studies which surveyed members of the general public opposed to surveying only college students. Age may be a variable that is irrelevant for future studies which examine the opinions and attitudes of college students.

Geographic Location

The sixth demographic variable examined in the current study was the effect of the student's geographic location on punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Most of the results of the bivariate analysis showed a lack of statistically significant support for the

idea that geographic location influences punitiveness and punitive attitudes with two exceptions. The first exception to the findings is a statistically significant bivariate relationship with the variable that a juvenile convicted of a serious property offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01 level). The second exception is a statistically significant bivariate relationship with the scale that a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level). No other punitive variables, or punitive scales, were statistically significant related with the variable used for geographic location.

Although, there was a lack of statistically significant bivariate relationships; the results of the current study showed mixed results when examining geographic location as being significantly related to variance in explaining punitiveness through analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). Geographic location was significantly related to the punitive scale used for sentencing juveniles convicted of a serious property, drug, and violent offense to adult prisons with a Sig Value of .040 which is significant as this is equal to or less than 0.05 with a moderate effect of 6.2% of the variance for this punitive scale. However, despite statistically significant differences in the levels of variance in punitiveness as explained by geographic location; the same statistically significant results were not present when examining variances using the punitive scale created for all punitive variables and the punitive scale created for trying juveniles as adults for serious property, drug, and violent offenses. Geographic location was dichotomized into either rural or urban, and the results of the linear regression found not statistically significant results for this variable. Geographic location was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression due to a lack of significant support for geographic location as being related to punitiveness when analyzing the data through bivariate relationships and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Previous research has typically ignored the question whether the area that someone grew up in impacts their viewpoints on punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Previous research that has examined this variable consists of the research conducted by Mackey and Courtright (2000) and Dozier (2009) Dozier (2009) with the results of the current study contrasting with both studies by Mackey and Courtright (2000) and Dozier (2009). Mackey and Courtright (2000) show a statistically significant relationship with

urbanicity and the opinions of college students when it comes to the criminal justice system. Research by Dozier (2009) shows geographic location being statistically significant related to the viewpoints of the students she researched. Geography is a variable that should be continued to be included in future research on punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Victimization

The seventh demographic variable examined in the current study was the impact of victimization on punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Bivariate analyses showed several statistically significant relationships. So, while a fear of victimization had no significant influence on punitiveness and punitive attitudes, actual victimization does have a statistical significant relationship with several of the punitive variables examined in this study. When conducting bivariate analyses and using victimization as a dichotomous variable, a significant positive relationship exists with: the belief that punishment should be the primary goal of the juvenile justice system (significant at the 0.05 level), a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level), a juvenile charged with a serious violent offense should be tried as an adult (highly significant at the 0.05 level) , a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level), the scale used for trying juveniles as adults (significant at the 0.05 level), and the scale used for all punitive variables (significant at the 0.05 level). Examining victimization as a total sum had a statistically significant positive correlation with the belief that a juvenile charged with a crime should have the same due process rights as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level) and was positively correlated at a significant level with the belief that a juvenile charged with a serious drug offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level). In addition to these relationships, being the victim of getting beaten up on the street was positively correlated with the belief that a juvenile accused of a crime should receive the same due process rights as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level). Finally, being the victim of a fight that one did not start was positively correlated with the belief that a juvenile charged with a crime should receive the same due process rights as an adult (highly significant at the 0.01 level) and with a belief that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be punishment (significant at the 0.05 level).

The study used ANOVA to test whether or not a statistically significant relationship existed for victimization and punitiveness. Two different ANOVA tests were used for the variable of victimization. The first ANOVA test examined victimization as a total sum of individual offenses committed against the student. The second ANOVA test examined victimization as a dichotomous variable, either you were a victim or you were not a victim and answered were recoded as such. As a sum, ANOVA testing showed that victimization had no statistically significant impact on the levels of variance in punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Associations were found when examining victimization as a dichotomous variable. Victimization as a dichotomous variable was significantly related to punitiveness when examining the punitive scale which included all punitive variables, with a small effect of 5.2% of the variance explained. The punitiveness scale created for trying juveniles as adults explained 5.8% of the variance. However, victimization as a dichotomous variable was not significantly related to punitiveness for the scale that was created for sentencing juveniles to serve their sentence in an adult prison.

The results of the linear regression found only one statistically significant result for the summed victimization variable in the model including Juveniles Should be Tried as Adult as the dependent variable. The ordinal logistical regression models did find statistically significant results. The first model used the predictor variables of victimization as a dichotomous variable and political scale in a liberal direction as an explanation for punitiveness. This first model was significant and explains 33.5% of the variance (Cox and Snell), 33.5% of the variance (Nagelkerke), 6.5% of the variance (McFadden). The second model used the predictor variables of victimization as a dichotomous variable and self-identification as a liberal as an explanation for punitiveness. The second model was significant and explains 21.2% of the variance (Cox and Snell), 21.3% of the variance (Nagelkerke), and 3.8% of the variance (McFadden). The third model used the predictor variables of victimization and self-identification as a conservative as an explanation for punitiveness. The third model was significant and explains 18.9% of the variance (Cox and Snell), 18.9% of the variance (Nagelkerke), and 3.3% of the variance (McFadden). The fourth model used the predictor variables of victimization as a dichotomous variable and self-identification as a moderate as an

explanation for punitiveness. The fourth model was significant and explains 17.8% of the variance (Cox and Snell), 17.8% of the variance (Nagelkerke), and 3.1% of the variance (McFadden).

The results of the current study appear to contrast with the results from previous research by Baron and Hartnagel (1996) and Dozier (2009) which showed a lack of statistically significant results when examining the influence of victimization on one's attitudes and opinions about the juvenile justice system, juvenile delinquency, and the criminal justice system. Most of the research in this area of public opinion has typically not examined the impact of victimization, and this is a variable which should continue to be examined in this area of public opinion research.

Attitudinal Variables

The final set of variables that the current study examined included three attitudinal variables and the impact they have on punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The current study examined the attitudinal variables of religious commitment, religious affiliation, and political party identification. All of the variables that were examined had previously been tested in prior research, and these variables were also used in order to further our current understanding for explanations of punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

Religious Commitment

The first attitudinal variable examined in the current study was commitment to one's religious beliefs and the effect on punitiveness and punitive attitudes towards the juvenile justice system. The results of the bivariate analysis showed a lack of statistically significant relationships for religious commitment influencing punitiveness and punitive attitudes. In addition to a lack of statistically significant bivariate relationships, the results of the current study show a lack of support for religious commitment being significantly related to variance as an explanation for punitiveness through analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). The results of the linear regression show no statistically significant results. Religious commitment was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression due to a lack of significant support for international student as being related to punitiveness when analyzing the data through bivariate relationships and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Level of commitment to one's religious beliefs and the influence that may or may not have on punitiveness, and punitive attitudes towards the juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquency has not been thoroughly explored in the prior research.

Religious Affiliation

The second attitudinal variable examined in the current study dichotomized religion into Catholic and Protestant. Other responses to the religious affiliation question were coded as missing due to their low number of responses and to facilitate analysis. The results of the bivariate analyses showed several statistically significant results for religious affiliation with punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The first bivariate relationship was religious affiliation and a juvenile charged with a violent offense should be tried as an adult (significant at the 0.05 level). The second bivariate relationship was religious affiliation and a juvenile convicted of a serious property offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (significant at the 0.05 level). The third bivariate relationship was between religious affiliation and a juvenile convicted of a serious violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison (highly significant at the 0.01 level). It is interesting to find significant bivariate relationships between religious affiliation and a juvenile charged with a serious property offense and charged with a violent offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison, however there was not a significant bivariate relationship for the third category of offense which was a juvenile convicted of a serious drug offense should serve their sentence in an adult prison. In addition to these significant bivariate relationships, religious affiliation was also significantly correlated with two of the three punitive scales used in the data analysis. The first relationship was with religious affiliation and the punitive scale created for sentencing juveniles to adult prisons (highly significant at the 0.01 level). The second relationship was with religious affiliation and the punitive scale created for all punitive variables (significant at the 0.05 level). The findings suggest that there is a statistically significant difference between Catholics and Protestants on these specific attitudes toward punitiveness and punitive attitudes.

While there were significant bivariate relationships, the results of the current study demonstrate a lack of support for religious commitment being significantly related to punitiveness through analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). Religious affiliation was

not included in the linear regression and was not included in the analysis of data using ordinal logistical regression.

The results of the current study are consistent with the results in the research conducted by Benekos et al. (2002) Applegate et al. (2009) which showed religion having a statistically significant relationship with opinions and attitudes concerning the juvenile justice system. The results of the research conducted by Applegate et al. (2009) showed that those who are fundamentalists and those who take a literal interpretation of the bible are likely to be more punitive. Still, little research has examined the role that religious affiliation plays in one's views of the juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquency and future research should continue to focus on this variable and the influence on public opinion in this area.

Political Party Identification

The third and final attitudinal variable examined in the current study looked at the role of political party identification and how this variable impacts punitiveness and punitive attitudes towards the juvenile justice system. The results of the bivariate analysis found statistically significant bivariate relationships between political party identification and punitive attitudes. Dichotomized into Democrat or Republican, political party identification was correlated with the Punitiveness Scale (-.341 at the .01 level), Tried as an Adult (-.340 at the .01 level), and Sentenced as an adult (-.289 at the .05 level). The results suggest being Republican is more closely assocatiated with being more punitive. Political party identification was found to be significantly related to punitiveness through analysis of variance testing (ANOVA). Political party identification explained the level of variance in punitiveness when examining the punitive scale using all punitive variables with 11.6% of the variance explained. Political party identification explained 11.5% of the variance with a juvenile being tried as an adult. Finally, political party identification explained 8.4% of the variance for a juvenile being sentenced as an adult.

The models which were used for linear regression found two models with statistically significant results with the dependent variable Punitiveness Scale. Political party identification was not included in the ordinal logistical regression.

The influence of political party identification was only previously examined in the research by Benekos et al. (2002) and although it was one of the questions asked by the

researchers, the researchers did not present any results other than the descriptive statistics for political party identification. Since this has not been a question asked in previous research, it is unclear whether the results of the current study are supported by other research or not. The influence of political party identification is a topic that should be considered in future research in public opinion on policies relates to the juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquency.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Before proceeding with the implications of the current study in the field of research on public opinion regarding the juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquency, the results of the current study come with a major caveat. As discussed previously in the findings and results chapter, the sample used in the current study was not a representative/random sample, but a purposive sample consisting of students in sociology classes at Lake Superior College in Duluth, MN. Therefore, the results of the current study cannot, and should not, be used to draw generalizations of the opinions of all college students about the juvenile justice system and juvenile delinquency since the results of the current study were not generated through the use of a representative/random sample. Furthermore, the results of the current study cannot, and should not, be used to draw generalizations of the general public as the study focused on college students.

The current study was conducted in order to better examine the opinions of college students when it comes to whether or not juveniles should receive the same due process safeguards as adults, what the primary goal of the juvenile justice system should be, whether a juvenile should be tried as an adult for serious property, drug, and violent offense, and finally, whether a juvenile should serve their sentence in an adult prison when convicted of a serious property, drug, or violent offense. The results of the current study demonstrates the theoretical framework by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) tends to be supported, indicating political ideology is among the best predictors of punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The more conservative a student, the more likely they are to be punitive and to support the legal processing of juveniles as adults and serving adult time for adult crimes. The more liberal a student, the less likely they are to be punitive and do not generally support the legal processing of juveniles as adults and serving adult time for adult crimes. While Langworthy and Whitehead's (1986) argument that political ideology is a strong indicator of punitiveness and punitive attitudes tends to be confirmed, the results of the current study suggested limited support for their second theoretical idea that fear of victimization predicts punitiveness and punitive attitudes. The results of the current study found victimization significantly related with punitiveness when examined as a dichotomous variable, a partial indication of support. Finally, the

results also showed political party identification (Democrat or Republican) as a significantly related variable with punitiveness.

Whenever research takes place, the researcher should ultimately ask why does it matter, why is it important, and what will it add to the preexisting body of research that is already established? The current study came about due to my experiences as a graduate assistant working with both on-ground and on-line juvenile delinquency classes and this interest was solidified when I was employed to teach two sections of juvenile delinquency at Lake Superior College in Duluth, MN. I was continuously amazed by these students whom I worked with and taught. While I would say that it was not true of all students, most students believed in the philosophy of "adult crime, adult time," and this is a philosophy that guided their views on trying and sentencing juveniles as adults. The benefits of the results of the current study are truly helpful to those who are instructors in the field of criminal justice, criminology, and sociology as it helps to understand the attitudes of the students we are teaching and their viewpoints on the critical issues of trying and sentencing juveniles as adults.

I believe that the work of those who teach in higher education continues to be challenging. Instructors should help students to understand the history of trying and sentencing juveniles as adults and that we are not moving forward, rather, we are moving backwards with punitive measures that were implemented in the 1990s.

Second, I believe that instructors need to help students understand what brought about these punitive measures. Kappeler et al. (2000) make the argument that our lawmakers and the media have a vested interest when it comes to focusing on crime and the criminal justice system, especially juvenile delinquency. If we were to listen to the media and television, one would be lead to believe that juvenile crime and juvenile violence is an epidemic plaguing our society. Yet, the statistics show that juvenile crime is actually decreasing in our society, as opposed to increasing. Furthermore, our politicians and government officials love to focus their attention on juvenile crime and juvenile violence. Politicians love to show that they are being tough on crime, love to be shown building more prisons, love to be shown increasing prison sentences, and love to be shown closing loopholes. It is politically expedient to be tough on crime; it is politically risky to be shown as weak on crime. Both of these institutions have a vested

interest in showcasing the worst of juveniles. The media loves these stories since it adds viewers and increased advertising revenue. Politicians want to be reelected, so they promote "get tough on crime" and have an easier ride to reelection in the next cycle. In the 1990s, we were told by lawmakers, and even some criminologists, to prepare for a juvenile crime wave, and the war on juveniles began in the United States.

In the 1990s, we began to incarcerate juveniles in numbers that had never before been seen in our country as a result of reform measures approved by the U.S. Congress and by state legislatures. Instead of the impact of deterring future crime, these reform measures most likely helped to foster future crime as opposed to deterrence. State legislatures began to increase the number of juveniles who could be tried in the adult criminal justice system and made it easier to transfer juveniles into the adult system, oftentimes at the sole discretion of prosecutors. Legislatures introduced what is referred to as blended sentencing whereby a juvenile serves a juvenile sentence with a concurrent adult sentence. Legislatures introduced mandatory sentencing which leaves no wiggle room as it comes to sentencing taking discretion out of the hands of judges. Legislatures introduced the extension of the juvenile justice system from the age of 18 to 21. Finally, state legislatures even went so far as to abolish confidential proceedings for juveniles in the juvenile justice system, one of the hallmarks built into the foundation of the juvenile justice system at its creation, and open up court proceedings for juveniles (Kappeler et al. 2000).

This discussion of the reform measures passed in the 1990s and the role of the media and our policymakers leads me to the third point that those in higher education need to educate their students on the harmful consequences for juveniles who serve adult time in adult prisons. Juveniles who are sentenced to serve their sentence in adult prisons are statistically speaking eight times more likely to commit suicide than those placed in a juvenile detention center. Juveniles sentenced to adult prisons are five times more likely to be the victims of sexual assault. Juveniles sentenced to adult prisons are twice as likely to be beaten by staff. Juveniles sentenced to adult prisons are 50% more likely to be attacked in prison with a weapon (Kappeler et al. 2000). Finally, allowing court records to be opened up can affect the abilities of juveniles as adults when it comes to employment and higher education. (Kappeler et al. 2000).

The reform measures of the 1990s began to chip away at the very heart of the juvenile justice system. The juvenile justice system was founded on the belief that juveniles were not simply mini-adults and could be rehabilitated when treated like we would treat an individual with a medical disease. The system was also founded on the belief that juveniles could make mistakes, and society would not hold that over their heads for the rest of their lives. It is also interesting to note that the juvenile crime wave of the 1990s was a myth that the American public bought into. It is quite simple how that works. If the media begins to focus more attention on a topic that they previously did not highlight, then the perception arises that we have a new social problem that we did not have before. With the evolution of new social problems, we see an evolution of solutions to these problems, and the solution in the 1990s to this new social problem of increased juvenile crime and violence was adult time for adult crimes. Our policymakers also played an important role in this as well (Kappeler et al. 2000).

While some suggest the punitive binge might finally be dissipating in our society, the consequences and long term effects of these actions in the 1990s are still alive and well in our society, and this is why it is important that we continue to research public opinion on issues related to trying and sentencing juveniles as adults.

There are several directions for future research on public opinion related to the primary goal of the juvenile justice system, whether juveniles should be tried as adults for serious offenses, and whether a juvenile should serve their sentence in adult prisons. The first direction for future research would be to employ a comparative study using two differing populations in order to understand the differences in punitiveness and punitive attitudes. One group should consist of college students and one group should consist of members of the general public. This is a direction that has not taken place yet in public opinion research concerning trying and sentencing juveniles as adults. The second direction that should take place would be to employ a long-term longitudinal study to see if punitive attitudes are maintained throughout one's life or if punitiveness and punitive attitudes decrease at some point in time. The results from previous research show that as age increases, punitiveness increases, and it would be a worthy research goal to better understand this relationship and understand at what point punitiveness and punitive attitudes take fruition as one ages. The third direction that the research in public opinion

should take is to conduct a random sample of college students in order for the results to be generalized against the entire population of college students. This may be a difficult task as it would be hard to employ a random sample of all college students, therefore researchers should continue to randomly sample college students at colleges that are selected to participate in this research. The fourth direction that the research in public opinion should take is to conduct a comparative analysis of differing institutions of higher learning. It would be a worthy research goal to conduct such a study at a community college, technical college, four year state university, and a four year private university. The fifth direction that the research in public opinion should take is to conduct a study which focuses on differences of level in support for rehabilitation and punishment amongst college students. The sixth and final direction is to include a variable related to social class as public opinion research at this point in time has typically ignored this variable, and, indeed, the research up to this point as it relates to college students has failed to examine the impact of social class on punitiveness and punitive attitudes. Public opinion research on issues related to the criminal justice system, and in particular with the juvenile justice system, is still a relatively new field for social research and it is a field of social research brimming with possibilities.

It is hopeful that it is possible that we are seeing the end of the punitive binge in our society. The state of Colorado in the 1990s implemented sentences of life without parole for juveniles, but in 2006, they rescinded these sentences due to increased evidence that juveniles are not the same as adults and should not be treated as such. The U.S. Supreme Court in 2005 in *Roper v. Simmons* reached the conclusion that it was unconstitutional to be executed for committing any criminal act under the age of 18, recognizing that juveniles are not the same as adults and adhering to international standards of decency which generally did not allow for the execution of those under the age of 18 at the time when they committed their offense(s). Furthermore, the U.S. Supreme Court in 2010 in *Graham v. Florida* held that it was unconstitutional for sentences of life without parole for non-homicide offenses committed by an individual under the age of 18, once again invoking international standards of decency which generally did not allow for this practice. Finally, the U.S. Supreme Court in 2012 in *Miller v. Alabama* expanded on their original ruling in the 2010 case of *Graham v.*

Florida ruling that sentences of life without parole, including offenses for murder, were unconstitutional and incompatible with the U.S. Constitution's eighth amendment prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. The U.S. Supreme Court, in their decision, believed that juvenile offenders had a constitutional right to be able to show that they can be rehabilitated. With these recent policy changes, it is hopeful that all members of our society, including the college students surveyed in the current study, will begin to realize that criminologist Michael Fagan's words are true "vengeance is not justice, vengeance is vengeance" (Bikel, 2007).

Appendix: A (Informed Consent)

You are invited to take part in survey research to examine the opinions of college students about the policies of the juvenile justice system, how juveniles who commit serious delinquent acts are sentenced, and how juveniles should be punished for committing serious delinquent acts. You have been chosen to participate in this study since your class was selected for participation. During the completion of this survey, you will also be asked to answer a small number of demographic questions, a series of questions about your opinion on several political issues, and a small number of questions regarding victimization and a fear of victimization.

This experience may cause some concern and be a stressful experience for students; especially for those who have been victimized in the past. For those students who may be affected by these questions, I would like to point out that Lake Superior College offers free counseling for those students who may find taking this survey to be psychologically stressful on them. LSC's Counseling Center employs Heidi Bagley and Marie Carter Brooks who will provide personal counseling if you choose to use this service. The Counseling Center is located at Lake Superior College in the S building in the Student Services Center. The phone number to call and make an appointment to meet with either Heidi or Marie is (218)733-7603 or 1-800-432-2884 ext. 7603.

Students under the age of 18 must NOT complete this survey. Although, the opinions of those under the age of 18 are important, those who are under 18 of age must not complete the survey. Students under the age of 18 should write "withdraw" on their survey and submit it blank at the same time as the other students who choose to complete the survey.

Completion of this survey will take no more than twenty minutes. Participation in this study is completely **VOLUNTARY**. If you choose to not participate in this study, you are completely free to do so without any consequences to you. Similarly, you are free to withdraw your participation from this study at any time during the process of completing the survey. If you have chosen to not participate in the study, simply write "withdraw" on your survey and turn it in at the time all surveys are turned in. All surveys which have the

word “withdraw” on them will be destroyed. If you decide to participate in the survey, you are asked to not include any information on the survey which could be used to identify you. This includes your name, your tech id, etc. This is done in order to ensure the survey remains anonymous. Furthermore, the information collected from each survey will only be looked at in conjunction with those from the other participants in this study. The information obtained form this study may be used for publication in scientific journals or presented at scientific conferences; however, your identity will remain anonymous. I will not be able to identify which survey came from which participant. All surveys will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the office of Dr. Paul Prew, professor in the Department of Sociology and Corrections at MSU-Mankato, and will be kept for a period of no less than 3 years.

As a student participating in the research process, you have several rights. These rights include the following:

- Your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to be in this study if you do not wish to be.
- You have the right to change your mind and withdraw from the study at any time without any reason and without any consequences to you.
- **You will be given a copy of this form to keep.**
- **Your decision whether or not to participate in this research will not affect your relationship with Lake Superior College and MSU-Mankato.**
- You do not waive any of your legal rights by signing this consent form.

One of the benefits by choosing to participate in this project will be to give you first hand experience with the research process and further understand the process of social research. You will also be helping to benefit those who teach juvenile delinquency and criminal justice classes by further expanding our knowledge of how and why college students believe a juvenile offender should be punished.

By giving your informed consent to participate in this project, you understand that the answers you provide on your survey will be kept confidential. You understand that Dr. Paul Prew and Richard Gehrke will have access to the data and that they guarantee the

preceding conditions in exchange for my agreement to participate in this study. Completed surveys will be kept in a locked file cabinet in Dr. Paul Prews' faculty office for no less than three years and then destroyed in a shredder.

If you have any questions or concerns you can call Dr. Paul Prew at: 507-389-5674 or email him at paul.prew@mnsu.edu . You may also mail him at Department of Sociology and Corrections, 113 Armstrong Hall, Mankato, MN 56001. Or you can also contact Richard Gehrke through e-mail at r.gehrke@lsc.edu or by phone at 218-733-5962. If you have further questions about the treatment of human subjects, you can contact MSU-Mankato's IRB Administrator, Dean Barry Ries at: barry.ries@mnsu.edu or by phone at 507-389-1242. When making contact about this study please refer to the project as IRBNet ID#: 727446.

By completing this survey, I assure the researchers that I am at least 18 years of age.

By completing this survey, I assure the researchers that I have read the above information and I understand that this survey is voluntary, and that my participation may stop at any time.

By completing this survey, I understand the risks and benefits by choosing to participate in this study.

By completing this survey, I understand that completion of the survey is giving the researchers my consent to participate in this study.

Appendix B: (Survey)

Please answer all questions on the survey truthfully and remember your answers will be kept confidential. Please do not skip any of the questions on the survey. Unless you have been instructed to check all that apply for a particular question, check only one answer for each question; or, legible write your answer to that question in the space provided. If you have any questions about the survey, please do not hesitate to ask.

1. What is your sex?

   _____Male

   _____Female

   _____Other

2. What is your age? (please specify)____
3. What is your race/ethnicity?

   _____White

   _____African-American

   _____Hispanic

   _____Other_____

4. What is your academic level?

   _____PSEO

   _____Freshman (0-29 Credits Completed)

   _____Sophomore (30-59 Credits Completed)

   _____Junior (60-89 Credits Completed)

   _____Senior (90 Credits or More Completed)

5. Are you an international student?

   _____Yes

   _____No

6. How would you describe the size of town or geographic region in which you were primarily raised?

   _____Rural

   _____Suburban

   _____Urban

7. On a scale of 1-5 with 1 being not at all committed and 5 being strongly committed, how committed are you to your religious beliefs? (Place your **numerical response** in the space provided)_____

8. How would you describe your religious affiliation?

   _____Catholic

   _____Protestant (e.g., Methodist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, UCC))

   _____Conservative Protestant

   _____Jewish

   _____Muslim

   _____None

   _____Other (please specify)_____

9. To which political party do you most closely identify with?

   _____Democrat

   _____Independent

   _____Republican

   _____Other (please specify)

10. How many hours a week do you watch television?

    _____0 hours

    _____1-2 hours

    _____3-4 Hours

    _____5 Hours Or More

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a check mark in the appropriate space as to whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neutral or no opinion, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree.

11a: Any raise in the federal minimum wage is unnecessary and will hurt small business.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neutral or No Opinion
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

11b: Congress should propose and the states should approve a constitutional amendment to outlaw abortion.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neutral or No Opinion
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

11c: The death penalty is immoral and should never be used by the government.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neutral or No Opinion
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

11d: The government should cut taxes for citizens even if it means that some government programs will not be funded.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

11e: There should be more money in our federal budget for environmental regulations.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

11f: Universal right to healthcare is a fundamental right which government should guarantee for all citizens.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

11g: Congress should propose and the states should ratify an amendment to the U.S. constitution outlawing gay marriage.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

11h: I consider myself to be a liberal.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

11i: I consider myself to be a conservative.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

11j: I consider myself to be a moderate.

____ Strongly Agree

____Somewhat Agree

____Neutral or No Opinion

____Somewhat Disagree

____Strongly Disagree

11k: It is the responsibility of government to provide assistance to the poor and needy.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

12. On a scale from 1-5, with 1 being not fearful at all and 5 being very fearful, how much would you say you fear being the victim of the following crimes? (Place your **numerical response** in the space provided for each statement)

_____Having someone break into your car

_____Having your car stolen

_____Having someone break into your house/apartment/dorm

_____Being robbed

_____Being mugged on the street

_____Being sexually assaulted

_____Being assaulted

_____Being murdered

13. Please indicate the number of times that you were a victim of any of the following crimes within the past year. If you were not the victim of any of the following crimes, please write 0: (Place your **numerical response** in the space provided for each statement)

_____Someone broke into your house/apartment/dorm

_____Someone stole property from your house/apartment/dorm

_____Someone broke into your car

_____Someone stole your car

_____Someone pick-pocketed your wallet or stole your purse

_____Someone threatened to beat you up on the street

_____Someone mugged you while walking on the street.

_____Someone beat you up in a fight that you did not start

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a check mark in the appropriate space as to whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neutral or no opinion, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree.

14. A juvenile accused of a crime should receive the same due process rights as an adult.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

15. The main purpose of the juvenile court system should be to **treat and rehabilitate** young offenders.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

16.The main purpose of the juvenile court system should be to **punish** young offenders.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

17. A juvenile charged with a **serious property crime** should be tried as an adult.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

18. A juvenile charged with **selling illegal drugs** should be tried as an adult.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

19. A juvenile charged with a **serious violent crime** should be tried as an adult.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

20. A juvenile convicted of a **serious property crime** should serve their sentence in an adult prison.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

21. A juvenile convicted of **selling illegal drugs** should serve their sentence in an adult prison.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

22. A juvenile convicted of a **serious violent crime** should serve their sentence in an adult prison.

_____Strongly Agree

_____Somewhat Agree

_____Neutral or No Opinion

_____Somewhat Disagree

_____Strongly Disagree

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey. If you have any questions or concerns, contact either Richard Gehrke or Dr. Paul Prew in the Dept. of Sociology and Corrections at MSU-Mankato.

Appendix C (Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics)

Table 1a Statistics

		Sex	Age	Race Ethnicity	Academic Level	International Student	Geographic Region
N	Valid	110	106	109	109	110	104
	Missing	1	5	2	2	1	7

Table 1b Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	54	48.6	49.1	49.1
	Female	56	50.5	50.9	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 1c Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18.00	11	9.9	10.4	10.4
	19.00	25	22.5	23.6	34.0
	20.00	23	20.7	21.7	55.7
	21.00	12	10.8	11.3	67.0
	22.00	4	3.6	3.8	70.8
	23.00	3	2.7	2.8	73.6
	24.00	3	2.7	2.8	76.4
	25.00	2	1.8	1.9	78.3
	27.00	5	4.5	4.7	83.0
	28.00	3	2.7	2.8	85.8
	29.00	1	.9	.9	86.8
	30.00	4	3.6	3.8	90.6
	32.00	2	1.8	1.9	92.5
	34.00	1	.9	.9	93.4
	35.00	2	1.8	1.9	95.3
	36.00	1	.9	.9	96.2
	40.00	1	.9	.9	97.2
	42.00	1	.9	.9	98.1
	48.00	1	.9	.9	99.1
	52.00	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	106	95.5	100.0	
Missing	System	5	4.5		
Total		111	100.0		

Race Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	96	86.5	88.1	88.1
	African-American	6	5.4	5.5	93.6
	Hispanic	2	1.8	1.8	95.4
	Asian	3	2.7	2.8	98.2
	Native-American	2	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 1e Academic Level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	PSEO	2	1.8	1.8	1.8
	Freshman	51	45.9	46.8	48.6
	Sophomore	47	42.3	43.1	91.7
	Junior	6	5.4	5.5	97.2
	Senior	3	2.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 1f International Student

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Intl Stud	1	.9	.9	.9
	Non Intl Stud	109	98.2	99.1	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 1g Geographic Region

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rural	34	30.6	32.7	32.7
	Suburban	43	38.7	41.3	74.0
	Urban	27	24.3	26.0	100.0
	Total	104	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	7	6.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2A: Religious Affiliation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Catholic	23	20.7	21.3	21.3
	Protestant	38	34.2	35.2	56.5
	Conservative Protestant	1	.9	.9	57.4
	Muslim	1	.9	.9	58.3
	None	24	21.6	22.2	80.6
	Non-Denominational	4	3.6	3.7	84.3
	Christian	9	8.1	8.3	92.6
	Karma	1	.9	.9	93.5
	Agnostic	4	3.6	3.7	97.2
	Dudeist	1	.9	.9	98.1
	Baptist	1	.9	.9	99.1
	Spiritual	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	108	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	2.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2B: Religious Commitment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not At All	30	27.0	27.5	27.5
	2.00	19	17.1	17.4	45.0
	2.50	1	.9	.9	45.9
	3.00	28	25.2	25.7	71.6
	3.50	2	1.8	1.8	73.4
	4.00	12	10.8	11.0	84.4
	Strongly Committed	17	15.3	15.6	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2c: Political Party Identified

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Democrat	44	39.6	40.7	40.7
	Independent	23	20.7	21.3	62.0
	Republican	28	25.2	25.9	88.0
	Libertarian	3	2.7	2.7	90.7
	Anarchist	1	.9	.9	91.6
	None	7	6.3	6.5	98.1
	Green	1	.9	.9	99.1
	Socialist	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	108	97.3	100.0	
	Missing System	3	2.7		
	Total	111	100.0		

Table 2da:Victimization Statistics

		Victim Broken In	Victim Stolen Personal Property	Victim Broken Car	Victim Stolen Car	Victim Pick Pocket	Victim Threatened To Beat Up	Victim Mugged	Victim Fight Did Not Start
N	Valid	104	102	104	104	104	104	103	104
	Missing	7	9	7	7	7	7	8	7
Mean		.1346	.4706	.2885	.0096	.1346	.3558	.1068	.0673
Std. Deviation		.39555	1.14931	.60215	.09806	.59214	.79949	.48330	.28776

Table 2db: Victim Stolen Personal Property

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	74	66.7	72.5	72.5
	1.00	18	16.2	17.6	90.2
	2.00	8	7.2	7.8	98.0
	5.00	1	.9	1.0	99.0
	9.00	1	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	102	91.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	8.1		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2dc: Victim Broken Car

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	81	73.0	77.9	77.9
	1.00	17	15.3	16.3	94.2
	2.00	5	4.5	4.8	99.0
	3.00	1	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	7	6.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2dd: Victim Stolen Car

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	103	92.8	99.0	99.0
	1.00	1	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	7	6.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2de: Victim Broken In

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	92	82.9	88.5	88.5
	1.00	10	9.0	9.6	98.1
	2.00	2	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	104	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	7	6.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2df: Victim Pick Pocket

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	96	86.5	92.3	92.3
	1.00	5	4.5	4.8	97.1
	2.00	2	1.8	1.9	99.0
	5.00	1	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	7	6.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2dg: Victim Threatened To Beat Up

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	83	74.8	79.8	79.8
	1.00	9	8.1	8.7	88.5
	2.00	9	8.1	8.7	97.1
	3.00	2	1.8	1.9	99.0
	4.00	1	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	7	6.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2dh: Victim Mugged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	97	87.4	94.2	94.2
	1.00	3	2.7	2.9	97.1
	2.00	1	.9	1.0	98.1
	3.00	2	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	103	92.8	100.0	
Missing	System	8	7.2		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2di: Victim Fight Did Not Start

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	98	88.3	94.2	94.2
	1.00	5	4.5	4.8	99.0
	2.00	1	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	93.7	100.0	
Missing	System	7	6.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table Statistics For Political Ideology

		Minimum Wage Increase	Outlaw Abortion	Death Penalty	Cut Taxes	More Money For Environment	Health Care Human Right	Gay Marriage Outlawed	Liberal	Conservative	Moderate	Poor Assistance
N	Valid	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	109	109	109	109
	Missing	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Mean		3.3545	3.7182	3.4000	3.0818	2.1000	1.7091	3.9000	2.7706	3.1101	2.7339	2.3028
Std. Deviation		1.17767	1.38889	1.32166	1.20497	.81218	1.12800	1.49587	1.11083	1.20446	.78931	1.13451

Minimum Wage Increase

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	6	5.4	5.5	5.5
	Somewhat Agree	25	22.5	22.7	28.2
	Neutral or No Opinion	23	20.7	20.9	49.1
	Somewhat Disagree	36	32.4	32.7	81.8
	Strongly Disagree	20	18.0	18.2	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Outlaw Abortion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	12	10.8	10.9	10.9
	Somewhat Agree	10	9.0	9.1	20.0
	Neutral or No Opinion	23	20.7	20.9	40.9
	Somewhat Disagree	17	15.3	15.5	56.4
	Strongly Disagree	48	43.2	43.6	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Death Penalty

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	14	12.6	12.7	12.7
	Somewhat Agree	15	13.5	13.6	26.4
	Neutral or No Opinion	19	17.1	17.3	43.6
	Somewhat Disagree	37	33.3	33.6	77.3
	Strongly Disagree	25	22.5	22.7	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Cut Taxes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	9	8.1	8.2	8.2
	Somewhat Agree	31	27.9	28.2	36.4
	Neutral or No Opinion	29	26.1	26.4	62.7
	Somewhat Disagree	24	21.6	21.8	84.5
	Strongly Disagree	17	15.3	15.5	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

More Money For The Environment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	25	22.5	22.7	22.7
	Somewhat Agree	54	48.6	49.1	71.8
	Neutral or No Opinion	27	24.3	24.5	96.4
	Somewhat Disagree	3	2.7	2.7	99.1
	Strongly Disagree	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Health Care Human Right

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	69	62.2	62.7	62.7
	Somewhat Agree	20	18.0	18.2	80.9
	Neutral or No Opinion	10	9.0	9.1	90.0
	Somewhat Disagree	6	5.4	5.5	95.5
	Strongly Disagree	5	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Gay Marriage Outlawed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	16	14.4	14.5	14.5
	Somewhat Agree	5	4.5	4.5	19.1
	Neutral or No Opinion	17	15.3	15.5	34.5
	Somewhat Disagree	8	7.2	7.3	41.8
	Strongly Disagree	64	57.7	58.2	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Liberal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	13	11.7	11.9	11.9
	Somewhat Agree	30	27.0	27.5	39.4
	Neutral or No Opinion	48	43.2	44.0	83.5
	Somewhat Disagree	5	4.5	4.6	88.1
	Strongly Disagree	13	11.7	11.9	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Conservative

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	11	9.9	10.1	10.1
	Somewhat Agree	21	18.9	19.3	29.4
	Neutral or No Opinion	41	36.9	37.6	67.0
	Somewhat Disagree	17	15.3	15.6	82.6
	Strongly Disagree	19	17.1	17.4	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Moderate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	6	5.4	5.5	5.5
	Somewhat Agree	30	27.0	27.5	33.0
	Neutral or No Opinion	64	57.7	58.7	91.7
	Somewhat Disagree	5	4.5	4.6	96.3
	Strongly Disagree	4	3.6	3.7	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Poor Assistance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	26	23.4	23.9	23.9
	Somewhat Agree	50	45.0	45.9	69.7
	Neutral or No Opinion	13	11.7	11.9	81.7
	Somewhat Disagree	14	12.6	12.8	94.5
	Strongly Disagree	6	5.4	5.5	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2ea: Fear of Victimization Statistics

		Fearful Car Broken In	Fearful Car Stolen	Fearful Dwelling Broken Into	Fearful Being Robbed	Fearful Being Mugged	Fearful Sexual Assaulted	Fearful Assaulted	Fearful Murdered
N	Valid	109	109	106	109	109	109	109	109
	Missing	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	2
Mean		2.7706	2.4771	2.9434	2.8440	2.7523	2.5413	2.7248	2.6697
Std. Deviation		1.20672	1.22924	1.41307	1.26326	1.32746	1.54280	1.31847	1.55787

Table 2eb: Fearful Car Broken In

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Fearful	19	17.1	17.4	17.4
	2.00	25	22.5	22.9	40.4
	3.00	39	35.1	35.8	76.1
	4.00	14	12.6	12.8	89.0
	Very Fearful	12	10.8	11.0	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2ec: Fearful Car Stolen

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Fearful	31	27.9	28.4	28.4
	2.00	25	22.5	22.9	51.4
	3.00	30	27.0	27.5	78.9
	4.00	16	14.4	14.7	93.6
	Very Fearful	7	6.3	6.4	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2ed: Fearful Dwelling Broken Into

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Fearful	22	19.8	20.8	20.8
	2.00	22	19.8	20.8	41.5
	3.00	22	19.8	20.8	62.3
	4.00	20	18.0	18.9	81.1
	Very Fearful	20	18.0	18.9	100.0
	Total	106	95.5	100.0	
Missing	System	5	4.5		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2ee: Fearful Being Robbed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Fearful	19	17.1	17.4	17.4
	2.00	25	22.5	22.9	40.4
	3.00	33	29.7	30.3	70.6
	4.00	18	16.2	16.5	87.2
	Very Fearful	14	12.6	12.8	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2ef: Fearful Being Robbed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Fearful	19	17.1	17.4	17.4
	2.00	25	22.5	22.9	40.4
	3.00	33	29.7	30.3	70.6
	4.00	18	16.2	16.5	87.2
	Very Fearful	14	12.6	12.8	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2eg: Fearful Being Mugged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Fearful	23	20.7	21.1	21.1
	2.00	28	25.2	25.7	46.8
	3.00	26	23.4	23.9	70.6
	4.00	17	15.3	15.6	86.2
	Very Fearful	15	13.5	13.8	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2eh: Fearful Sexual Assaulted

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Fearful	41	36.9	37.6	37.6
	2.00	21	18.9	19.3	56.9
	3.00	15	13.5	13.8	70.6
	4.00	11	9.9	10.1	80.7
	Very Fearful	21	18.9	19.3	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2ei: Fearful Assaulted

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Fearful	25	22.5	22.9	22.9
	2.00	26	23.4	23.9	46.8
	3.00	24	21.6	22.0	68.8
	4.00	22	19.8	20.2	89.0
	Very Fearful	12	10.8	11.0	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2ej: Fearful Murdered

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	1	.9	.9	.9
	Not Fearful	33	29.7	30.3	31.2
	2.00	25	22.5	22.9	54.1
	3.00	17	15.3	15.6	69.7
	4.00	8	7.2	7.3	77.1
	Very Fearful	25	22.5	22.9	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Students were asked to indicate how fearful they were of being the victim of several criminal offenses using a Likert scale of 1 indicating no fear and 5 being very fearful that they would be the victim of each listed criminal offense. The mean response rate that was given for each of these criminal offenses ranged from a score of 2, which would indicate a mean response of slightly above not fearful, and 3.

Table 2k:Statistics

		Due Process Rights	Primary Goal Treat and Rehab	Primary Goal Punish	Property Tried Adult	Sell Drugs Tried Adult	Violent Crime Tried Adult	Property Sentenced Adult	Sell Drugs Sentenced Adult	Violent Crime Sentenced Adult
N	Valid	109	109	108	109	108	110	110	110	110
	Missing	2	2	3	2	3	1	1	1	1
Mean		2.8716	1.4954	3.2222	2.8349	2.8519	2.1364	3.4727	3.5636	2.7727
Std. Deviation		1.35470	.76526	1.29941	1.22106	1.41299	1.19998	1.22444	1.31698	1.41200

Table 2l:Due Process Rights

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	17	15.3	15.6	15.6
	Somewhat Agree	39	35.1	35.8	51.4
	Neutral or No Opinion	11	9.9	10.1	61.5
	Somewhat Disagree	25	22.5	22.9	84.4
	Strongly Disagree	17	15.3	15.6	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2m: Primary Goal Treat and Rehab

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	68	61.3	62.4	62.4
	Somewhat Agree	33	29.7	30.3	92.7
	Neutral or No Opinion	3	2.7	2.8	95.4
	Somewhat Disagree	5	4.5	4.6	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2n: Primary Goal Punish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	11	9.9	10.2	10.2
	Somewhat Agree	26	23.4	24.1	34.3
	Neutral or No Opinion	21	18.9	19.4	53.7
	Somewhat Disagree	28	25.2	25.9	79.6
	Strongly Disagree	22	19.8	20.4	100.0
	Total	108	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	2.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2o: Property Tried Adult

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	16	14.4	14.7	14.7
	Somewhat Agree	33	29.7	30.3	45.0
	Neutral or No Opinion	23	20.7	21.1	66.1
	Somewhat Disagree	27	24.3	24.8	90.8
	Strongly Disagree	10	9.0	9.2	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2p: Sell Drugs Tried Adult

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	23	20.7	21.3	21.3
	Somewhat Agree	29	26.1	26.9	48.1
	Neutral or No Opinion	15	13.5	13.9	62.0
	Somewhat Disagree	23	20.7	21.3	83.3
	Strongly Disagree	18	16.2	16.7	100.0
	Total	108	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	2.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2q: Violent Crime Tried Adult

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	37	33.3	33.6	33.6
	Somewhat Agree	48	43.2	43.6	77.3
	Neutral or No Opinion	6	5.4	5.5	82.7
	Somewhat Disagree	11	9.9	10.0	92.7
	Strongly Disagree	8	7.2	7.3	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2r: Property Sentenced Adult

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	6	5.4	5.5	5.5
	Somewhat Agree	23	20.7	20.9	26.4
	Neutral or No Opinion	21	18.9	19.1	45.5
	Somewhat Disagree	33	29.7	30.0	75.5
	Strongly Disagree	27	24.3	24.5	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2s: Sell Drugs Sentenced Adult

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	9	8.1	8.2	8.2
	Somewhat Agree	19	17.1	17.3	25.5
	Neutral or No Opinion	18	16.2	16.4	41.8
	Somewhat Disagree	29	26.1	26.4	68.2
	Strongly Disagree	35	31.5	31.8	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Table 2t: Violent Crime Sentenced Adult

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	23	20.7	20.9	20.9
	Somewhat Agree	36	32.4	32.7	53.6
	Neutral or No Opinion	13	11.7	11.8	65.5
	Somewhat Disagree	19	17.1	17.3	82.7
	Strongly Disagree	19	17.1	17.3	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

References

Anon. n.d. "5.4 Example 1-Running An Ordinal Regression on SPSS." *Using Statistical Regression Methods in Education Research. Retrieved 2015 (http://www.restore.ac.uk/srme/www/fac/soc/wie/researchnew/sreme/modules/mod5/4/1).*

Applegate, Brandon K. and Robin King Davis. 2006. "Public Views on Sentencing Juvenile Murderers: The Impact of Offender, Offense, and Perceived Maturity." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. 4:55-74.

Baron, Stephen W. and Timothy Hartnagel. 1996. "Lock 'Em Up": Attitudes Toward Punishing Juvenile Offenders. "Canadian Journal of Criminology. April: 191-212.

Babbie, Earl. 2004. The Basics of Social Research. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Benekos, Peter J., Alida V. Merlo, William J. Cook, Kate Bagley. 2002. "A Preliminary Study of Student Attitudes on Juvenile Justice Policy. " *Journal of Criminal Justice Education.* 13: 273-296.

Bikel, Ofra. 2007. *When Kids Get Life* WGBH Education Foundation.

Bishop, Donna M. 2006. "Public Opinion and Juvenile Justice Policy: Myths and Misconceptions." *Journal of Criminology & Public Policy*. Volume 5, Number 4. 653-664.

Czaja, Ronald and Johnny Blair. 2005. *Designing Surveys: A Guide to Decisions And Procedures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Dozier, Angela A. 2009. "Factors Influencing the Attitudes of College Students Towards Rehabilitation or Punishment of Criminal Offenders." M.A. Thesis, Department of Political Science, Texas State University.

Eskridge, Chris W. 1999. "A Brief Response to Students' Views on Criminal Justice, By Farnworth, Longmire, and West." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education.* 10:291-295.

Feld, Barry. 1993. "Juvenile (In) Justice and the Criminal Court Alternative." *Crime and Delinquency*. Volume 39, Issue 4. 403-424.

Falco, Diana L. 2008. "Assessing Students' Views Towards Punishment: A Comparison of Punitiveness Among Criminology and Non-Criminology Students." Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Criminology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Farnworth, Margaret, Dennis R. Longmire, Vincent M. West. 1998. "College Students' Views on Criminal Justice." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*. 9:39-57.

Grasmick, Harold G. and Anne L. McGill. 1994. "Religion, Attribution Style, and Punitiveness Toward Juvenile Offenders." *Criminology*. 32:23-40.

Hine, Thomas. 1999. *The Rise and Fall of the American Teenager.* New York, NY: Avon Books Inc.

Kendall, Diana. 2013. *Social Problems in a Diverse Society.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Langworthy, Robert H., and John T. Whitehead. 1986. "Liberalism and Fear as Explanations of Punitiveness. *Criminology*. Volume 24, Number 3. 575-591.

Lake Superior College Fact Book. *Lake Superior College*. N.p., 2014. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. https://www.lsc.edu/wp-content/uploads/LSC-Fact-Book-2014.pdf

Moon, Mellisa M., Jody L. Sundt, Francis T. Cullen, and John Paul Wright. 2000. "Is Child Saving Dead? Public Support for Juvenile Rehabilitation." *Crime & Delinquency*. 46:38-60.

Nagin, Daniel S., Alex R. Piquero, Elizabeth Sc. Scott, Laurence Steinberg. 2006. "Public Preferences for Rehabilitation Versus Incarceration of Juvenile Offenders: Evidence from a Contingent Valuation Survey." *Criminology and Public Policy.* Volume 5, Issue 4. 627-652.

Pallant, Julie. 2007. *SPSS Survival Manual.* New York, NY: Open University Press.

Payne, Brian K. and Allison Chappell. 2008. "Using Student Samples in Criminological Research." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*. 19:175-192.

Perelman, Abigayl M. and Carl B. Clements. 2009. "Beliefs About What Works In Juvenile Rehabilitation: The Influence of Attitudes on Support for Get Tough and Evidence-Based Interventions." *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 36: 184-197.

Piquero, Alex R. and Laurence Steinberg. 2010. "Public Preferences for Rehabilitation Versus Incarceration of Juvenile Offenders." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education. 1-6.*

Platt, Anthony. 1969. "The Rise of the Child-Saving Movement: A Study in Social Policy and Correctional Reform." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Vol. 381: 21-38.

Salant, Priscilla and Don A. Dillman. 1994. *How to Conduct your own Survey.* New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Sample Size Calculator." *–Confidence Lvel, Confidence Interval, Sample Size, Population Size, Relevant Population.* Web. 27 Feb. 2015. http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm.

Scheingold, Stuart A. 2007. *The Politics of Law and Order: Street Crime and Public Policy.* New York, NY: Longman Inc.

Schwartz, Ira M., Shenyang Guo, and John J. Kerbs. 1993. "The Impact of Demographic Variables on Public Opinion Regarding Juvenile Justice: Implications for Public Policy." *Crime & Delinquency.* 39:5-28.

Schwartz, Ira M. Shenyang Guo, and John J. Kerbs. 1996. "Public Attitudes Toward Juvenile Crime and Juvenile Justice: Implications for Public Policy." Pp. 13-18 in *Exploring Delinquency Causes and Control, edited by Dean G. Rojek and Gary F. Jensen. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.*

Sheley, Joseph F. 1985. *America's Crime Problem: An Introduction to Criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Skovron, Sandra Evans, Joseph E. Scott, and Francis T. Cullen. 1989. "The Death Penalty for Juveniles: An Assessment of Public Support." *Crime & Delinquency*. 35:546-561.

Tabachnick, Barbara G. and Linda S. Fidell. 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.